JOURNAL

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

(New Series)

EDITED BY

Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, M.A., Ph.D. (Berlin),
A. A. A. FYZEE, M.A. (Cantab.), Bar-at-Law.
Prof. N. K. BHAGWAT, M.A.

VOLUME V

Published by the Society.

London Agent:
ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN
41, Great Russell Street, London, W.C. 1
1929

THE TIMES OF INDIA PRESS, BOMBAY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

New Series, Vol. V.

ARTICLES.

BRIEF NOTE.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

JOURNAL

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

Vol. 5. 1929 Nos. 1 & 2.

PAÑCATANTRA STUDIES.

By A. VENKATASUBBIAH.

(*Continued from Vol. 4, p. 26.*)

4. THE BRĀHMANA AND THE ROGUES.

The story of the *Brāhmaṇa and the Rogues* is found in all the older versions of the Pañca., that is to say, in T, SP, Spl, Pu, So, Ks, Du, and Pa.[1] In Du, it is related to the ox Sañjīvaka by the jackal Davanaka and occurs in that section of the first Book which describes how he went to Sañjīvaka and made him believe that the lion Piṅgalaka was meditating treachery against him. This section begins on p. 132 and relates (1) that the jackal went to Sañjīvaka and informed him that the lion had avowed his intention to kill him, and (2) that Sañjīvaka was stunned by the news, and after expatiating on the futility of serving kings, opined that the jealousy of other courtiers was at the root of it, and related to the jackal the story of the *Lion's Retainers and Camel* [Du I. 19=T I. 9; in Du, the story of the *Monkey Nāḷījaṅgha and the sage Gautama* is emboxed within this story]. It is then related in this section that the jackal agreed with the opinion of Sañjīvaka and recounted to him in turn the story of the *Brāhmaṇa and the Rogues*, and then said, "Again, several rogues, combining together, deceived the king and the teacher Prabhākara-bhaṭṭa before he could say

[1] Besides the abbreviations mentioned on pp. 1, 21 of Vol. 4 *ante*, I have here made use of the abbreviation Sy to denote the Older Syriac translation from the Pahlavi. The references in this article are to Schulthess's German translation of it as cited in the *Pañca.* of Prof. Edgerton.

'ambaṣṭa[2] Chandoraga': and many wicked people, combining together, vociferously declared that the learned Brāhmaṇa Vararuci was an outcaste (caṇḍāla). When such is the case, what is the fate of others?"

The verse that introduces this story in this version reads as:

bahavo balavantaś ca kṛtavairāś ca śatravaḥ |
śakyā vañcayituṁ buddhyā brāhmaṇaṁ chāga-kurkurāt |;

and the story itself, briefly, is as follows:—

Four rogues who saw a Brāhmaṇa carrying a goat entered into a plot to get it from him by making him believe that it was a dog and thus causing him to abandon it. In accordance therewith, each one of them met the Brāhmaṇa singly and asked him why he was carrying a dog. After the second and third queries, the Brāhmaṇa set down the beast he was carrying, felt it all over, and convinced himself that it was indeed a goat and not a dog. When, however, the fourth rogue, too, asked him the same question, the Brāhmaṇa thought that either he must have lost his senses or that the thing he was carrying must be an evil being capable of assuming any form at will. He therefore put the goat down in fear and ran away in haste; and the rogues, laughing at his simplicity and admiring their own cleverness, took and ate it.

In the recensions of T, SP, Spl, Pn, So, Ks, and Pa, on the other hand, the story is related by the crow-minister Cirajīvin to the crow-king Meghavarṇa and is found in the third Book. For the rest, however, these versions differ amongst themselves in several respects:

(1) The verses that introduce the story in these versions differ in their readings not only among themselves but from that of Du also. In T, the introductory verse reads as, *bahavo balavantaś*[3] *ca kṛta-vairāś ca śatravaḥ* | *śaktā vañcayituṁ prājñaṁ brāhmaṇaṁ chagalād iva* ||; in SP, as *bahavo balavantaś ca kṛta-vairāś ca śatravaḥ* | *buddhyā vañcayituṁ śakyā brāhmaṇaś chāgalād iva* ||, in Spl, as *bahu-buddhi-samupetāḥ su-vijñānā balotkaṭān* | *śaktā vañcayituṁ dhūrtā brāhmaṇaṁ chāgalād iva* ||, and in Pn, as *bahu-*

[2] The meaning of this passage is obscure. It is perhaps said in it that the wicked people deceived the king and made him believe that the learned Brāhmaṇa Prabhākara was not a Brāhmaṇa at all, but an ambaṣṭha.

[3] This is the reading found in all the MSS. Hertel, however, prints *'balavantaś*; see below.

buddhi-samāyuktā suvijñānā balotkaṭāḥ | *śaktā vañcayituṁ dhūrtāś chāgaka-brāhmaṇaṁ yathā* ||. In the Nepalese version[4] of the Pañca., the verse reads as *bahavo balavantaś ca kṛtavairāś ca śatravaḥ* | *śakyā vañcayituṁ buddhyā brāhmaṇaś chāgalād iva* ||.

(2) There is a difference in the number of rogues mentioned by these versions. The number is six in T, So and probably in Ks, and three in SP, Spl and Pn; it is four in one of the Pahlavi versions (Sy), three in two others (Keith-Falconer's translation of the Younger Syriac, and John of Capua's Latin version), and two in the versions of Symeon Sethi and Wolff.

(3) And thirdly, while the rogues, in T, So, Ks, SP, and Pa inquire of the Brāhmaṇa, on each of the three (two) occasions, why he was carrying a dog, it is said in Spl and Pn that the second rogue asked him why he was carrying a dead calf, and the third, why he was carrying an ass.

Which of the above-mentioned versions of the story and of the introductory verse is original and correct, and which, later and corrupt? Did the author of the original Pañca. include this story in the first book or in the third? Did he mention two, three, four, or six rogues in the story? Did he use the words *śakyāḥ* and *brāhmaṇaḥ* or *śaktāḥ* and *brāhmaṇam* in the introductory verse? And did the rogues, in the original story, all inquire about the carrying of the dog, or about the carrying of the dead calf and ass also? These are some of the questions that arise in one's mind in connection with this story, and that require an answer.

Some of these questions have already been discussed by Prof. Hertel in the introduction to his edition of the SP. Regarding the introductory verse, it is his opinion that T's reading of it is original and correct, and that of SP corrupt. He writes there on p. xxxvii, after reproducing the readings[5] of the SP MSS. in pādas c and d, as follows :—

> " It thus follows that the archetype of SP read essentially like Śār. [*i.e.*, T]; only, it had the worse reading *buddhyā*

[4] I shall hereafter refer to this version as N.

[5] In c, the MSS. NOMEFHGT read *buddhyā vañcayituṁ śakyā* ; ACLD, *śaktā vañcayituṁ buddhyā* ; B, *buddhyā va° śaktā* ; X, *śakyā va° yuddhyā* ; K, *śaktyā va° bu°* ; and Q, *śakyā vaṁca° budhyā*. In d, BX have *brāhmaṇam*; FHCTNGLEOQA have *brāhmaṇaś* and a reading intended for *chāgalād iva* ; K has *brāhmaṇaś cāgavān iva*.

in c and probably *chāgalād*—compare however L—in d. The reading *śakyā* that is found in c in most of the MSS. is due to a misunderstanding of the introductory verse. K leads us to its right understanding; that is to say, one should write in Śar. also ° *balavantaś*, and should translate the verse as, 'Many foes that are (really) powerless and (yet) have begun hostilities, are able to defraud a wise person in the same way as the Brāhmaṇa out of the goat.' With this reading a l o n e (*'balavantaś*) does the verse fit into the context. The rogues are, in spite of their number, powerless as against the Brāhmaṇa because he has as his weapon the much-dreaded curse, a motive which is in fact turned to account in another old Pañca. story (SP. III. 10). ......

The variations of most of the SP MSS. can now likewise be traced back to the misunderstood *'balavantaś*. The adjectives in the first two pādas were referred to the Brāhmaṇa, and hence the nominative appears in d instead of the accusative in all the MSS. except two (BX) or four (DM). In spite of the nominative, ACL—compare K—have *śaktā*. But because this adjective is used in the a c t i v e sense only, there appears of necessity a further correction: *śaktā* is changed to *śakyā* in QXNOMEFHGT—the reading of K is restored by a correction,—and the verse, in the light of these alterations, has to be interpreted as, 'Many foes that are powerful and have begun hostilities can be defrauded through cunning, as the Brāhmaṇa out of the goat.' In this case, *kṛtavairāś* does not, certainly, accord with the story at all, nor does *bahavo*. Because of *bahavo*, AQO change *brāhmaṇaś* into *brāhmaṇāś*."

Similarly, it is the opinion of Prof. Edgerton also that the word used originally in pāda a is *abalavantaḥ*, and that the original verse read as in T except that it probably had *buddhyā* or its equivalent in c instead of *prājñam* (see his *Pañca*., 1, 313). That is to say, the original verse, according to him read as,

bahavo 'balavantaś ca kṛta-vairāś ca śatravaḥ |
śaktā vañcayituṁ *buddhyā* brāhmaṇaṁ chāgalād iva ||;

and signified, "Many powerless adversaries, opening hostilities, can succeed in tricking their enemy by their wits, as happened to the brāhman in the case of the goat."

All this is incorrect, and the misunderstanding is really on the part of Hertel (and Edgerton), and not on the part of the redactor of the SP. For, in the first place, though the word *abalavat* is not ungrammatical, it is doubtful whether one writer even has made use of it in his work. The word is not to be found either in the PW or Apte or in Schmidt's *Nachträge zum Böhtlingk's Wörterbuch;* and the word *abala*, which is one syllable shorter, is generally found used by writers in its stead. I consider it, therefore, extremely improbable that the author of the original Pañca. would have used in his work a word that no other writer has, so far as we know, used. Secondly, even if one grants that such a thing is possible, the introductory verse of T and PR, with the reading *abalavantaḥ* in pāda a, does not suit the context: it speaks of many powerless foes being able to deceive (others), while Book III in all the Pañca. versions (T, SP, Spl, Pn, So, Ks, and Pa) has for its theme the description of how one crow deceived and destroyed many owls. Compare in this respect the following passages, namely, T. Ab-216: *tad evaṁ gate sāma-dāna-bheda-daṇḍānāṁ caturṇāṁ nayānāṁ nāsty avakāśaḥ | asti pañcamo ' py aśāstra-kartur nayaś chalo nāma | tam aṅgīkṛtya svayam evāhaṁ tad-vijayāya paribhavāya ca prayatiṣye |*; T. Ab. 218: *tad deva asti kiṁ cid vaktavyam | tac cāvadhārya yathoktam anuṣṭheyam | so ' bravīt | tāta atha kim | Cirajīvy ahā | deva māṁ vigata-pakṣaṁ, kṛtvā "hāryair asṛgbhir abhyukṣyāsmān nyagrodha-pādapāt prakṣipyāpayānaṁ kṛtvarṣyamūka-parvate sa-parivāras tiṣṭha | yāvad ahāṁ tān sapatnān śāstra-praṇītena vidhinā dakṣiṇāśāmukhān kṛtvā kṛtārthas tvat-sakāśam āgacchāmi |*; SP. p. 47, (l. 1317 f): *ataḥ samāśrayaś cintyatām | sa ca śarīra-vyayenāpi mayā prayatnād anuṣṭhātavyaḥ | ... tasmān mām iha luñcita-śarīraṁ kṛtvā pūrva-hatānāṁ rudhireṇāvalimpatu | aham atra tiṣṭhāmi | yūyam Āpatyakaśṛṅgaṁ nāma parvataṁ gatvā tatra tiṣṭhata | ahaṁ ca śatru-saṁśrayaṁ kṛtvā vipan-nistaraṇādikaṁ cintayāmi |*; Spl. p. 60 and Pn.* p. 193; *vatsa evaṁ gatepi ṣāḍ-guṇyād aparaḥ sthūlo ' bhiprāyo 'sti | tam aṅgīkṛtya svayam evāhaṁ tad-vijayāya yāsyāmi ripūn vañcayitvā vadhiṣyāmi |* and Spl. p. 61 and Pn. p. 196: *vatsa ākarṇaya | tarhi sāmādīn atikramya yo mayā pañcama upāyo nirūpitaḥ | tan māṁ vipakṣabhūtaṁ kṛtvā 'tiniṣṭh-*

* The passages in Pn differ slightly from the Spl passages that are cited here, but have the same import.

ura-vacanair bhartsaya ... gamyatāṁ parvatam ṛśyamūkaṁ prati | *tatra sa-parivāras tiṣṭha yāvad ahaṁ sapatnān supraṇītena vidhinā viśvāsābhimukhān kṛtvā kṛtārtho jñāta-durga-madhyo divase tān andhatāṁ prāptāṁs tvāṁ nītvā vyāpādayiṣyāmi* | that are put into the mouth of Cirajīvin and that immediately precede and follow the story of the *Brāhmaṇa and the Rogues* in these versions. Compare also T. p. 141 : *tad rājan yathā Mandaviṣeṇa maṇḍūkā nihatāḥ* | *tathā mayāpy aśeṣāś satravo hatāḥ* | ... *Meghavarṇa āha* | *evam etat ... tad evaṁ bhavatā niśśeṣāś śatravaḥ kṛtāḥ* | ; SP, p. 53 (l.1149) : *tad rājan yathā tena maṇḍūkā bhakṣitās tathā mayā śatravo nirdagdhāḥ* | ; Spl. p. 73 : *Meghavarṇa āha* | *tat kṛtaṁ niṣkaṇṭakaṁ me rājyaṁ śatrūn niśśeṣatāṁ nayatā tvayā* | ... *tan nāsti tvat-samo 'nyo mantrī yena śastra-mokṣaṇaṁ vināpi sva-buddhyā śatravo hatāḥ* | ; Pn. p. 225 : *rājan yathā Mandaviṣeṇa buddhi-balena maṇḍūkā nihatāḥ* | *tathā mayāpi sarve vairiṇaḥ* | ... *Meghavarṇo 'bravīt* | *evaṁ etat* | .. *tvayā* "*anukūlyenānupraviśyārimardanas saparijano niśśeṣitaḥ* | ; So, 162 : *mayāpy anupraviśyaivaṁ deva tvad-ripavo hatāḥ* ; Sy (Ab. 188.39) : "Dann zieht mein Herr mit dem ganzen Gefolge an den und den Ort. Dort bleibt bis ich ein Mittel gefunden habe, die Eulen zu vernichten. (Ab. 219.4) Der Rabenkönig sprach : Du hast ihre Wurzel und ihren Namen vernichtet. So hast auch du sie nicht durch harte, sondern durch zahme Mittel vernichtet."

It will be seen that all the above-mentioned versions agree in saying that it was Cirajīvin who destroyed the enemies, and not many crows. The introductory verse, however, as read by Hertel and Edgerton, speaks of many powerless foes being able to deceive (others) ; and it is therefore inconsistent with the rest of the book and does not fit into the context at all. The epithet *kṛtavairāś* too does not fit either the crows or the rogues ; for, there is nothing related about their 'having commenced hostilities' in either the frame-story or in the story of the *Brāhmaṇa and the Rogues.*

The above-mentioned objections, it may be observed, hold good even when one reads *balavantaḥ,* instead of *abalavantaḥ,* in the introductory verse of T and Edgerton's Pañca. The verse would still refer to many foes being able to deceive others, and would, as pointed out above, be in disaccord with the context. The epithet *kṛtavairāḥ* would still be inappropriate, and not suit

the crows and the rogues; and in addition, the epithet *balavantaḥ* too would be inappropriate. For, far from being *balavantaḥ*, the crows were, as is related in the frame-story of Book III, *abalāḥ*; compare T. III. 2: *pravṛddha-cakreṇākrānto rājñā balavatā 'balah*.

It thus becomes evident that Hertel's opinion that T's reading of the introductory verse is correct and original, that, in this verse, *'balavantaś* is the correct reading, and that this reading alone suits the context, is wrong. In reality, the epithets *bahavo balavantaś ca kṛtavairāś ca śatravaḥ* in pādas a, b of the verse, refer neither to the crows nor to the rogues, nor even to indefinite and unknown persons, but to the owls.[7] They are, too, quite appropriate in this connection; for the owls are the enemies of the crows (cp. T.

---

[7] In this connection, it is possible to argue that the above-cited speeches of Meghavarṇa are only intended to praise Cirajīvin and to express how greatly the crows are indebted to him, but that the owls were, in reality, destroyed by many crows as related in SP., 1428 ff.: *dṛṣṭas sāro balaṁ caiṣāṁ durgaṁ cāpi yathārthataḥ | ahīna-kālam adhunā kartavyaḥ saṅkṣayo dviṣām || ity ālocyolūkotpāṭanāya durga-dvāra-koṭarān kariṣa-pūrṇān kṛtvā satvaraṁ Meghavarṇa-samīpaṁ gataḥ | Megavarṇena sukham āliṅgya vārttāṁ pṛcchyamāna evam uktavān | nāyaṁ vārttā-kathana-kālaḥ | kālo 'tikrāmati param | tena yūyaṁ sarva eva kāṣṭhādikaṁ gṛhṇīdhvam | aham api vahniṁ gṛhītvā'gamiṣyāmi | sahasaiva gatvā sarvaiḥ śatru-sahitaṁ śatru-sthānaṁ dahyatām iti | tathaivānuṣṭhāya kariṣa-pūrṇa-koṭareṣu kāṣṭhādikaṁ datvā vahnir nikṣiptaḥ | anantaram ekadaiva sarve śatravo nirmūlitāḥ ||*. See also T, Ab. 243-4, Spl, p. 71, 12ff., Pn. 210, 20 ff.

Though there may be some force in this argument, (1) it is shown by the use of the word *śatravaḥ* in pāda b that the epithets *bahavaḥ*, (*a*) *balavantaḥ kṛtavairāḥ* and *śatravaḥ* do not refer to the crows but to the owls; for, no speaker refers to himself and his followers as the 'enemies' (of others), but, on the other hand, speaks of others as 'enemies'. Thus there can hardly be any doubt that the word *śatravaḥ* used by the crow-minister Cirajīvin in this verse refers to the owls in the same way as it, used by the owl-minister Vakranāsa in T. III. 79: *śatravo 'pi hitāyaiva vivadantaḥ parasparam*, refers to the crows. (2) Again, in case one regards the readings of T or PR as correct and looks on *bahavaḥ*, etc., as referring to the crows, the construction of the verse would be ungrammatical as *vañcayitum* would have no object in connection with the crows (that is, there would be no *upameya* to correspond to the *upamāna brāhmaṇam*). (3) The attribute *prājña* too (in T's reading) fits neither the Brāhmaṇa nor the owls, who, as shown by the story, are the reverse of *prājña*.

Thus, these considerations too make it clear that the readings *abalavantah*, *śaktā* (*ḥ*) and *brāhmaṇam* are incorrect.

Ab. 198 : *tasya ca śatrur Avamardo nāmolūkarājaḥ*), are many in number (cp. ibid. *ulūkasahasra-parivāraḥ*), and have begun hostilities against the crows (cp. ibid. *sa vairānuśayād ulūka upalabdha-durga-vṛttāntaḥ kāla-bala-śaktyā mahatolūka-saṅghātena tasyopari sannipatitaḥ | mahac ca teṣāṁ kadanaṁ kṛtvā 'payātaḥ*). They are also powerful, as is shown by the epithet *balavatā* applied to them in T. III. 2 : *pravṛddha-cakreṇākrānto rājñā balavatā 'balaḥ* and in T. Ab. 201-2 : *balavatā vigṛhītasya* by the crow-ministers Uddīpin and Sandīpin ; and hence, too, it becomes clear that the word used in pāda a is *balavantaś* and not *' balavantaś*. It likewise becomes clear from T. Ab. 216 and the other passages cited above (p. 5) which speak of Cirajīvin's deceiving of many enemies (and not of many persons deceiving others), that the word originally used in pāda c, was *śakyā* (*ḥ*) as is given in the majority of the SP MSS., Du, and N, and not *śaktā* (*ḥ*) as is given in T ; and further, it is indicated by the agreement of Du and N that the original reading of pāda c was *śakyā vañcayituṁ buddhyā* as is given in those versions and in the SP MSS QX (and also K ?).

With regard to pāda d, the use of *śakyā* (*ḥ*) in c indicates that the correct reading there is *brāhmaṇaś*, as given in SP and N, and not *brāhmaṇam;* but I do not think it probable that the rest of the pāda read *chagalād iva* or *chāgalād iva* as given in SP, N, and T. For, there is no example to be met with elsewhere of the verb *vañc* combined with a word in the ablative case and signifying, ' to defraud .. out of.. ' (see PW and Apte) ; and I cannot believe that the author of the original Pañca. would have made use of such an ungrammatical construction.[8] It seems to me therefore very likely that the original verse had the reading *brāhmaṇaś chāgavān iva* (this is the reading of the SP MS K) or something similar to it.

The foregoing observations all refer to the frame-story and introductory verse of T, SP, Spl, Pn, Ks, So and Pa which are all descended from Viṣṇuśarman's recension of the Pañca, and have no bearing on Du, which is descended from Vasubhāga's recension of that book. The context in this version (see p. 1 above) *does* show

[8] Pn's reading, *śaktā vañcayituṁ dhūrtāś chāgakabrāhmaṇaṁ yathā*, in which the ablative is avoided, seems to indicate that he too felt averse to combining *vañc* with an ablative.

unmistakably that the words *bahavo . . śatravaḥ* all refer to the rogues of the story. The epithets *balavantaḥ* and *kṛtavairāḥ*, however, do not, as pointed out above, suit the rogues; nor does the epithet *śatravaḥ* also, for there is nothing said in the story to show that the rogues were the enemies of the Brāhmaṇa. Again, the combination *brāhmaṇaṁ vañcayituṁ śakyāḥ* in padas c, d is ungrammatical, and so likewise is the combination *brāhmaṇaṁ chāga-kurkurād vañcayitum*. All this makes it evident that the Du reading of the introductory verse is corrupt.

Hence, there seems to be no doubt that, as determined above, the original verse read :

bahavo balavantaś ca kṛtavairāś ca śatravaḥ |

śakyā vañcayituṁ buddhyā

in the first three pādas, and *brāhmaṇaś chāgavān iva* or something similar to it, in the fourth pāda. And it follows from this, that in the original Pañca., the story occurred in the third Book (as it does in the versions descended from Viṣṇuśarman's recension), and not in the first, as it does in Du. The meaning of the verse is : " Many foes that are powerful and have begun hostilities, can, like the Brāhmaṇa with the goat, be deceived [by one] through astuteness." As already said above, the foes referred to here are the owls, and Cirajīvin declares in this śloka that he will, through his wit, deceive the owls though they are many and powerful, in the same way as the rogues, through their wit, deceived the Brāhmaṇa with the goat. Compare in this connection Sy, Ab. 186 : " Der Rabe sprach : Wir wollen weder die Eulen bekriegen, noch die Zahlung eines Tributen auf uns nehmen, aus dem Grunde den ich bereits erwähnt habe. Vielmehr wollen wir[9] ihnen durch List schweren Schaden zufügen, wie sie die schlauen Männer gegen jenen Asketen anwendeten, indem sie ihm über etwas ihre Zweifel äusserten, dessen er doch ganz sicher war."

With regard to the inquiry about the carrying of the dead calf and ass, Du agrees with T, SP (this has a lacuna here), So, Ks and Pa in saying that all the rogues inquired of the Brāhmaṇa why he

---

[9] There can be no doubt that the Sanskrit original of Pa had *aham* here, and that the plural *wir* is inaccurate.

was carrying a dog; and this agreement shows that the version of the story contained in Spl and Pn is corrupt, and that contained in Du, T, etc., is original and correct.

Lastly, regarding the number of the rogues mentioned in the story, it is the opinion of Hertel, who has discussed this question on p. xxxix of SP and pp. 32-33 of *Tantra.-Über.*, Vol. I, that the number six mentioned in T and So is original and correct and that the number three mentioned in SP, Spl and Pn, is not. Here too, the agreement of Du, which is a representative of Vasubhāga's recension of the Pañca., with Sy which is derived from Viṣṇuśarman's recension, seems to me to indicate that the number mentioned in the original was, neither six nor three, but four.

In conclusion, I may mention that this story occurs in the *Hitopadeśa* also in the fourth Book, that it is introduced there by the verse, *ātmaupamyena yo vetti durjanaṁ satyavādinam | sa eva vañcyate tena brāhmaṇaś chāgato yathā* ||, that the number of rogues mentioned in this version is three, and that each of them asked the Brāhmaṇa why he was carrying a dog. Owing however to the fact that the author Nārāyaṇa has introduced many changes when incorporating the material of the Pañca. into his book, it is not possible to utilise his version of the story as evidence for or against any of the conclusions arrived at above.

VEDIC STUDIES.

By A. Venkatasubbiah.

Second Series.[1]

(Continued from Vol. 4, p. 156.)

2. Smaddiṣṭi.

This is a word that occurs in four passages of the RV only; it is neither mentioned nor explained in the *Nighaṇṭu* and *Nirukta*. Sāyaṇa gives four different explanations of it,—*bhadravākya*, *praśastadarśana*, *praśastātisarjanaśraddhādidānāṅgayukta*, and *kalyāṇādeśin*. Roth explains it as 'geschult, dressiert, eingeübt' in the PW, and Grassmann as 'mit Lenkung versehen, 1) gut lenkend; 2) gut zu lenken'. Ludwig, in his *RV. Über.*, has interpreted it differently as 'die glück herbringen'; 'deine weisung geht hieher (=du selbst unabhängig mit herrschaft über uns)'; 'mir hier bestimmte' and 'hieher die weisung habende.' Geldner, in his *Glossar*, gives the meanings "1) dessen Weisungen gleich sind, gerecht 3.45.52 2) gleichmässig geschult,—eingelernt 6.63.9; 7.18.23; 10.62.10." In his *RV. Über.*, however, he translates the word in 3.45.5 as 'gleichmässig zuteilend' and gives the following note: "*smaddiṣṭi* sonst ein technischer Ausdruck der Dānastuti's (6.63.9; 7.18.23; 10.62.10). Hier wohl in etwas anderem Sinn. *diṣṭi* ist im RV. unbelegt und *smad* auch sicher nicht bestimmt. Sāy.: *bhadravākyaḥ* in dem er *smat* im Sinn von *sumat* nimmt." Oldenberg, on the other hand, observes[2] (*RV. Noten*, I, 251): "*smaddiṣṭi* mir dunkel. Es findet sich sonst (6.63.9; 7.18.23; 10.62.10) von geschenkten Sklaven, Rossen, Stieren (?) in Dānastutis. In Bezug auf eine Schenkung heisst es V, 36.31 *yo rohitau vājinau vājinīvān tribhiḥ śataiḥ sacamānāv adiṣṭa*: gibt dies

---

[1] The first series of these *Studies* are published in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 55 ff.

[2] He also urges against Geldner's explanations (*in Glossar*) the criticisms (1) that they are not in accord with the meaning of *smat*, and (2) that the two proposed meanings are separated by too wide a gulf.

adiṣṭa, wenn es von *diś* kommt, den Schlüssel zu *smaddiṣṭi*? *diś* wäre offenbar "zuweisen"; *smaddiṣṭi* hiesse etwa "begleitet von (einem Akt der) Zuweisung." Ein solches Wort lässt sich von Geschenke brauchen, aber auch—und das müsste hier angenommen werden—vom Schenken, der, wo er auftritt, von Taten der Freigebigkeit begleitet ist."

It is plain from the above that Geldner and Oldenberg, Sāyaṇa and Ludwig, are at sea regarding the meaning of the word; and as for the meanings proposed by Roth and Grassmann, it can be readily seen that they do not fit well into the context in all the four passages and that they are therefore incorrect.

The word *smaddiṣṭi* is a bahuvrīhi compound composed of *smat* (or *smad*) and *diṣṭi*. This latter word *diṣṭi*, though it does not (as observed by Geldner) occur elsewhere in the RV, is used frequently in later literature where it has the sense of 'fate, fortune, good fortune'; see Apte. The former word *smat* is found used in the RV only; it occurs, uncompounded, in thirteen passages, and compounded with *abhīśu*, *ibha*, *iṣṭa*, *ūdhas*, *puraṁdhi* and *rātiṣāc* in one passage each, and with *diṣṭi*, in four passages. In these four passages, Sāyaṇa, as we have already seen, explains *smat* as *praśasta*, *bhadra*, or *kalyāṇa*. Likewise, in ten of the remaining passages too, (1.51.15; 5.41.15; 5.41.19; 5.87.8; 7.3.8; 8.18.4; 8.20.18; 8.25.24; 8.26.19; 8.28.2) he declares it to be a synonym of, or explains it as, *su-*, *praśasta* or *śobhana*. In explaining 1.186.6, he writes: *smat sahārthe prāśastye vā vartate| atra praśaṁsāyām*; and he regards it as the equivalent of *saha* in 8.186.8 and 8.34.6 and of *saha* or *praśasta* in 7.87.3. In 1.100.13, he explains it as *bhṛśam*, in 2.4.9 as *ati-prabhūtam*, in 10.61.8, as *asmattaḥ*, and in 1.73.6 as *nitya* (*smac-chabdo nitya-śabda-samānārthaḥ*); in 10.42.4 he regards *smadibha* as a proper name.

The meanings *atiprabhūta*, *bhṛśa*, *nitya* and *asmattaḥ* seem to have been invented by Sāyaṇa for the occasion and need not be considered seriously. The meanings *śobhana* (*praśasta*, *su-*) and *saha*, on the other hand, belong to a different category; and in fact, it is the opinion of Roth (PW), Grassmann, Wackernagel (*Ai. Gr.* II. 1.p.287), Macdonnell (*Ved. Gr.* p. 424), Oldenberg (*RV. Noten* II, p. 7) and other European exegetists that *smat*

is a synonym of *saha*, while, for my part, I am inclined to prefer the meaning *śobhana*. See below.

So far as the compound word *smaddiṣṭi* is concerned, its meaning remains the same whether one regards *smat* as the equivalent of *saha* or of *śobhana*. In the former case, the word means 'accompanied by good luck,' and in the latter case, 'having good luck.' In either case, therefore, the word *smaddiṣṭi* means 'with good luck; having good luck.'

The good luck that is referred to here is that caused, or brought, by auspicious marks; for it is the belief of the Indian Aryans that certain marks on the body, borne by men, women, horses, dogs, cocks, etc., bring good or bad luck to the possessor. Such belief, for instance, is alluded to by Āśvalāyana's words (GS. 1.5.3): *buddhi-rūpa-śīla-lakṣaṇa-sampannām arogām upayaccheta* which enjoin that the girl one marries must have *lakṣaṇāni* or auspicious marks on her body. A similar injunction is contained in *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.52: *avipluta-brahmacaryo lakṣaṇyāṁ striyam udvahet;* while Śāṅkh. GS. 1.5: *kumāryai pāṇiṁ gṛhṇīyāt| yā lakṣaṇasampannā syāt| yasyā abhyātmam aṅgāni syuḥ samāḥ keśāntāḥ| āvartāv api yasyai syātāṁ pradakṣiṇau grīvāyām| ṣaḍ vīrān janayiṣyatīti vidyāt* specifies some of the auspicious marks and Manu (3.8-10): *nālomikāṁ nātilomām . . na piṅgalām haṁsa-vāraṇagāminīm tanuloma-keśa-daśanām mṛdvaṅgīm* describes some of the inauspicious as also auspicious marks of a girl.

AV. 1.18 : *nir lakṣmyaṁ lalāmyaṁ*
nir arātiṁ suvāmasi|
atha yā bhadrā tāni naḥ
prajāyā arātiṁ (for saṁ?) nayāmasi||
nir araṇiṁ savitā sāviṣat pador
nir hastayor varuṇo mitro aryamā|
nir asmabhyam anumatī rarāṇā
premāṁ devā asāviṣuḥ saubhagāya||
yat ta ātmani tanvaṁ ghoram asti
yad vā keśeṣu praticakṣaṇe vā|
sarvaṁ tad vācā 'pa hanmo vayaṁ
devas tvā savitā sūdayatu||

riśyapadīṁ vṛṣadatīṁ
goṣedhāṁ vidhamām uta |
viliḍhyaṁ lalāmyaṁ
tā asman nāśayāmasi ||

is a charm against unlucky marks: the gods Savitṛ, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman and Anumati are implored to remove, *i.e.*, to render innocuous, the evil marks (in a woman's body according to Kauśika-sūtra 42.19: *nir lakṣmyam iti pāpa-lakṣaṇāyā mukham ukṣaty anvṛcaṁ dakṣiṇāt keśa-stukāt*) and to confer *bhadrāṇi* and *saubhagam* (*i.e.*, auspicious marks) on her. Similarly, Ap.MB. 1.1.3: *abhrātṛghnīṁ varuṇāpatighnīṁ bṛhaspate*| *indrāputraghnīṁ lakṣmyaṁ tām asyai savitaḥ suva* refers to marks that presage good to brothers, husband and sons, and *ibid.* 1.10.3: *yā 'syāṁ patighnī tanūḥ prajāghnī paśughnī lakṣmighnī jāraghnīm asyai tāṁ kṛṇomi* refers to the body, *i.e.*, without doubt, to the body-marks, that forebode destruction and death of husband, children, cattle and wealth. Similarly, there is no doubt that the expressions *apatighnī* and *śivā paśubhyaḥ* in RV. 10.85.14: *aghoracakṣur apatighny edhi śivā paśubhyaḥ sumanāḥ suvarcāḥ* have the same meaning as the words *apatighnī*, etc., have in Ap.MB. 1.1.3 cited above and refer to bodily marks that presage good to husband and cattle.

A detailed description of such bodily marks and of their effects is given in *Agnipurāṇa*, *Garuḍapurāṇa*, *Bṛhat-saṁhitā* and other such works. In the last-mentioned book, ch. 69 deals with *kanyā-lakṣaṇa*, and Varāhamihira observes in verse 1, after enumerating some auspicious marks, that the person who marries the girl with such marks would become king (*tām udvahed yadi bhuvo 'dhipatitvam icchet*), and in verse 3, that the marks described therein bring the possessor much wealth (*vipulāṁ śriyam ādadhāti*). The commentator Bhaṭṭotpala too cites in the course of his commentary on the 3rd and 4th verses, the following observations of Samudra: *nābhi-deśaḥ suguptaś ca yasyāḥ sā dhana-bhāginī; jaghanaṁ vipulaṁ yasyāḥ susparśaṁ romavarjitam* | *suvarṇābharaṇair yuktā sā bhaved rājya-bhāginī*. Similarly, Varāhamihira observes in *ibid*, 61.1-2, with reference to some auspicious marks of the dog and the bitch: *yasya syāt sa karoti poṣṭur acirāt puṣṭāṁ śriyaṁ śvā gṛhe* and *yā sā rāṣṭraṁ kukkurī pāti puṣṭā* (*i.e.*, the owner of such bitch becomes the ruler of a kingdom), and in 62.3, with reference

to a hen having auspicious marks : *sā dadāti sucirarh mahīkṣitāṁ śrī-yaśo-vijaya-vīrya-sampadaḥ.* In *ibid.* 63.2, he describes some auspicious marks of tortoises and remarks of a tortoise having such, that it causes the expansion of the kingdom (*so 'pi nṛpāṇāṁ rāṣṭra-vivṛddhyai*) and Bhaṭṭotpala cites, in his commentary on 63.3, the verse : *strī-putra-matidaṁ vidyāt kūrmaṁ rāṣṭra-vivardhanam.* In *ibid.* 64.9, Varāhamihira, after describing four kinds of well-favoured goats, writes, *te catvāraḥ śriyaḥ putrā nālakṣmīke vasanti te ;* and in 60.18 observes of a bull with auspicious marks that he brings wealth to his owner (*svāminam acirāt kurute patiṁ lakṣmyāḥ*).

Smaddiṣṭi thus primarily signifies' possessing auspicious marks that bring to the possessor good luck (*i.e., śrī, yaśaḥ, vijaya, vīrya, rājya, strī, putra, buddhi,* etc., as described above).' Since however the possession of auspicious marks makes for beauty also, the word has the secondary sense of 'handsome, beautiful.' It is a synonym of the words *bhadra, kalyāṇa, maṅgala, śobhana,* (cf. Amara-kośa 133 : *bhadraṁ kalyāṇaṁ maṅgalaṁ śubham*), *subhaga* and *subhāga*[3] all which mean 'having good luck ; handsome, beautiful.'

I shall now show that the above-mentioned two meanings fit well into the context in all the passages in which *smaddiṣṭi* occurs.

3.45.5 : *svayur indra svarāḷ asi*
smaddiṣṭiḥ svayaśastaraḥ |
sa vāvṛdhāna ojasā puruṣṭuta
bhavā naḥ suśravastamaḥ ||

" Thou, O Indra, goest wherever thou listest ; thou art sovereign, handsome and very famous. O thou that art much praised, be our best hearer, growing in strength." The word *svayuḥ* in pâda a is obscure. If one interprets it in the manner of *aśvayu, vasūyu, rathayu,* etc., the meaning would be, 'eager for one's own self,' which is not very intelligible. The word occurs again in 2.4.7 : *sa yo vy asthād abhi dakṣad urvīṁ pasūr naiti svayur agopāḥ*

---

[3] *Bhāga* means also 'luck, fortune' ; see Apte and compare the words *bhāgya* and *bhāgadheya.* There is thus no doubt that *subhāga* signifies 'having good luck ; handsome' in the RV verses in which it is used and that Grassmann is wrong in explaining it as 'schönem Antheil, schönes Gut besitzend' in his *Wörterbuch.*

where it is said of Agni that he spreads himself on the earth, burning, and that he is *svayu*, like a cow without a cowherd. *svayu* seems to denote here, 'one who goes wherever one lists' and I have hence so explained it in 3.45.5 also.

svayaśastara=suyaśastara (see Ind. Ant. 56 .36) and not 'selbst bewusst' as Geldner translates in his *RV. Über*. *smaddiṣṭi*=having auspicious marks; handsome; compare the epithets *bhadra* and *susaṁdṛś* that are applied to Indra in 1.82.3: *susaṁdṛśaṁ tvā vayaṁ maghavan vandiṣīmahi* and 1.132.2: *ahann indro yathā vide śīrṣṇā-śīrṣṇopavācyaḥ | asmatrā te sadhryak santu rātayo bhadrā bhadrasya rātayaḥ*.

6.63.9: *uta ma ṛjre purayasya raghvī*
sumīḷhe śataṁ peruke ca pakvā |
śāṇḍo dād dhiraṇinaḥ smaddiṣṭīn
daśa vaśāso abhiṣāca ṛṣvān ||

"And [were given] to me two swift mares by Puraya, a hundred by Sumīḷha, and cooked foods by Peruka. Śāṇḍa gave ten oxen, big, obedient (?) having auspicious marks and adorned with gold ornaments." Regarding the auspicious marks of oxen, see ch. 60 of Bṛhat-saṁhitā; and regarding the gift of oxen decked with golden ornaments, compare Mahābhārata 1.216.17: [*Pāṇḍubhyaḥ prāhiṇod dhariḥ*] *dāntān sauvarṇaiḥ śubhraiḥ paṭṭair alaṁkṛtān*.

7.18.23: *catvāro mā paijavanasya dānāḥ*
smaddiṣṭayaḥ kṛśanino nireke |
ṛjrāso mā pṛthiviṣṭhāḥ sudāsas
tokaṁ tokāya śravase vahanti ||

"The four fleet horses, decked with golden ornaments and having auspicious marks given to me by Sudās, son of Pijavana, in the sacrifice, being on the earth, carry me (and my) offspring to offspring and renown." Regarding the auspicious marks of horses, see ch. 65 of Bṛhatsaṁhitā. *nireke=vāje*, 'in the sacrifice'; see the article on this word in Vol. 4 *ante* (pp. 147 ff.).

The import of the second hemistich is not clear and the word *pṛthiviṣṭhāḥ* in pāda c is perplexing. Geldner, in his *Glossar*, gives the word as *pṛthiviṣṭhā*, 'auf der Erde stehend' (though the Saṁhitā and Padapāṭha both have °ṭhāḥ), but does not indicate with what word it is to be construed. Ludwig regards it as an

irregular genitive singular, referring to Sudās, who, according to him, stays on the earth 'ausz hochachtung'! It seems plain that the word is an epithet of *ṛjrāsaḥ* or horses, and I have so explained it in my above translation. I cannot see, however, any force in the word, and I am inclined to believe that the opposite of *pṛthiviṣṭhāḥ*, namely *diviṣṭhāḥ*, would be much more appropriate here; compare the expression *divi dhāvamānam* used of a horse in Kaurayāṇa's Dānastuti of Medhyātithi Kāṇva in 8.3.21: *yaṁ me dur indro varuṇaḥ pākasthāmā kaurayāṇaḥ | viśveṣāṁ tmanā śobhiṣṭham upeva divi dhāvamānam*.

Regarding the words *mā. . . tokam* in this hemistich, I have followed Geldner (*Kommentar*) in understanding it as 'me (and my) offspring'; Sāyaṇa, however, regards *tokam* as an attribute of *mā* (*tokaṁ putravat pālanīyaṁ māṁ vasiṣṭham*); and similarly Oldenberg too (RV. Noten, II, p. 23) suggests the explanation, "(mich) der ich (selbst) das Kind (eines berühmten, ähnlich erfolgreichen Vaters) bin."

10.62.10 : *uta dāsā pariviṣe*
smaddiṣṭī gopariṇasā |
yadus turvaś ca māmahe ||

"And Yadu and Turva gave me for my service two handsome slaves, supplemented by cows (*i.e.*, in addition to cows)." Regarding the gift of slaves, compare 8.56.3: *śataṁ me gardabhānāṁ śataṁ ūrṇāvatīnām | śataṁ dāsāṅ ati srajaḥ* and also the following verses:

. . . . . *tadā rājā Yudhiṣṭhiraḥ* ||
eko ratho vāraṇa eka eva
daśaśva-saṁkhyāś ca suvarṇa-bhāraḥ |
śataṁ gavāṁ hema-vibhūṣaṇānāṁ
prasthaś ca datto vara-mauktikānāṁ |
ekaikaśo bhṛtya-catuṣṭayaṁ ca
kāryeṣu dakṣaṁ sa dadau nṛpendraḥ ||
ṛtvigbhyaḥ . . . .

in Jaiminīyāśvamedha (64.46-48; p. 152a) which describe the gifts made by King Yudhiṣṭhira to the priests who officiated in his *aśvamedha* sacrifice.

* * * * *

With reference to the word *smat*, I have already observed on p. 12 above that it is the opinion of Sāyaṇa (on 1.186.6 ; 8 ; 7.87.3), Roth, Grassmann, Oldenberg and other exegetists that it is the equivalent of *saha*, a meaning, which, it must be acknowledged, fits fairly satisfactorily into the context in all the verses in which the word occurs. I have also observed that Sāyaṇa (on 1.51.15 ; 5.41.15 ; etc.) has explained the word as the equivalent of *su-*, *praśasta*, *śobhana*, *kalyāṇa* or *bhadra*, and that, for my part, I am inclined to believe that this is the real meaning of the word. The reasons for such belief are as follow :

1. It is the opinion of Sāyaṇa, given expression to in the course of his commentary on 2.4.9 (*smat sumad ati-prabhūtam*), 8.26.19 (*smat sumat śobhanam*), 8.25.24 (*smat sumad ukāra-lopaś chāndasaḥ*) and 8.28.2 (*smat sumat śobhanā*), that *smat* is identical with *sumat*. A like opinion is expressed by Roth, too, who writes (PW ; s.v. *smat*) " Wir halten es für eine andere Aussprache von *smat* ' ; and similarly Oldenberg, too, observes (RV. Noten, I,p. 76) : " Dass Identität von *sumat* und *smat* aufzugeben ist (Geldner *Ved. Stud.* 2, 190 ; Bartholomae BB 17,115), bezweifle ich. Der Gebrauch beider Worte zeigt zu auffallende Gleichartigkeit," and draws attention to the similar formation of the compounds *sumadratha* and *smad-abhīśu*, and of the sentences *sīdatāṁ sumat* and *smat sadantu*, *smac caranti ye.* This opinion seems to me to be justified and I agree with the above-named savants that *smat* is identical with *sumat.*

This word *sumat*, too, it is true, is explained by Roth, Grassmann, Oldenberg, and other exegetists as the equivalent of *saha.** But Geldner has, in his short article on this word in *Ved. St.* 2, p.190, pointed out that Sāyaṇa interprets it as *śobhana* or *kalyāṇa* in his commentary on 2.36.3 ; 3.3.9 ; 8.45.39 ; 87.4 ; and 10,32.3, and expressed the opinion that *sumat* can be best explained as *śobhana*. It is his belief that this word is derived from *su* with the suffix *mat* and means ' schön ;' and in support of such conclusion,

* The other explanations proposed for this word which is enumerated in the *Nighaṇṭu* (4,3) are :—*svayam* (Yāska in *Nirukta* 6.22.3 ; Durga and Devarāja) ; *svayam* or *svataḥ* (Sāyaṇa on RV 1.142.7 ; 162, 7 ; 5.2.4 ; 1.100.16) and *suṣṭhu mādyanti hṛṣyanti* (Sāyaṇa on TS 4.6.8.3 ; Mahīdhara on VS 26.24). See Geldner, l. c.

he points to the parallelism of *sumadratha*, used in 3.3.9 and 8.45.39 of Agni and *harī* with *suratha* used likewise of Agni and *harī* in 4.2.4 and 7.36.4.

This parallelism is by itself significant enough; but in addition we find the word *bhadra-jānayaḥ* in 5.61.4 is parallel to *sumaj-jāni* that occurs in 1.156.2 and *bhadra-vrāta* in 10.47.5 to *sumad-gaṇa* which occurs in 2.36.3; and the word *sumad-aṁśu* too, applied to a mare in 1.100.6 seems to be parallel to *sutuka* and *svañc* that are applied to horses in 10.3.7 and 7.56.16. Hence there does not seem to be any doubt that *sumat* is, as said by Geldner, equivalent to *śobhana*, *kalyāṇa* or *bhadra*; and I shall show presently that this meaning fits well into the context in all the passages in which the word occurs. Since however *smat* is identical with *sumat*, it follows hence that *smat* too signifies *kalyāṇa*, *śobhana* or *bhadra*.

2. A like conclusion is pointed to by the parallelism of some compounds beginning with *smat* also. To the word *smad-abhīśu*, used of a horse in 8.25.24 corresponds the word *svabhīśu* used likewise of horses in 8.68. 16,18; to the word *smad-diṣṭi* correspond, as already pointed out above, the words *subhaga* and *subhāga*; and to the word *smad-rātiṣācaḥ* 'conferring splendid gifts' in 8.28.2: *varuṇo mitro aryamā smadrātiṣāco agnayaḥ* corresponds *surātayaḥ* in 9.81.4: *ā naḥ pūṣā pavamānaḥ surātayo mitro gacchantu varuṇaḥ sajoṣasaḥ*.

It is therefore my belief that *sumat* or *smat* is the equivalent of *śobhana*, *kalyāṇa* or *bhadra*; and I shall now show that this meaning fits well into the context in all passages. I shall begin with those in which the form *sumat* occurs.

1.100.16 : *rohic chyāvā sumad-aṁśur lalāmīr*
dyukṣā rāya ṛjrāśvasya |
vṛṣaṇvantaṁ bibhratī dhūrṣu rathaṁ
mandrā ciketa nāhuṣīṣu vikṣu ||

"The red brown (mare) of fine speed, bright (*i.e.*, glossy), pleasing, having a spot on the forehead, that has been given to Ṛjrāśva and draws the chariot yoked with a steer has attracted notice among the Nahus clans." *sumad-aṁśu* in pāda a is somewhat ambiguous. Geldner, in his *RV. Über.*, translates it as 'schöngezeichnet (?)' and observes: "*sumadaṁśu*; mit schönen oder gleichmässigen

aṁśu versehen, *aṁśu* unbekannt, ob von der Zeichnung oder sonstigen Zieraten des Tiers ?" Apte, in his *Dictionary*, assigns to this word the meanings, among others, of (1) lustre, brilliance ; (2) speed ; and (3) garment, decoration ; and I have in the above translation, preferred the meaning 'speed.' Compare the epithets *sutuka*, and *svañc*, both meaning 'fine-going, *i.e.*, swift' that are applied to horses in 10.3.7 : *agniḥ sutukaḥ sutukebhir aśvaiḥ* and 7.56.16 : *atyāso na ye marutaḥ svañcaḥ*. It is however possible that the poet may have used the word *aṁśu* here in the sense of 'lustre, brilliance' (cp. the epithet *śobhiṣṭham* applied to a horse in 8.3.21 : *viśveṣāṁ tmanā śobhiṣṭham upeva divi dhāvamānam* ; compare also the epithet *candrāṁśu-sama-varcasām* in the *Mahābhārata* passage, 1,247,40 cited below) or of 'garment, decoration' ; compare the epithets *hiraṇinaḥ* and *kṛśaṇinaḥ* in 6.63.9 and 7.18.23 cited above. Compare also 8.68.16 : *surathāñ ātithigve svabhīśūṁr ārkṣe āśvamedhe supeśasaḥ* and *Mahābhārata* 1.216.17 : [*Pāṇḍubhyaḥ prāhiṇod Dhariḥ*] *gajān vinītān bhadrāṁś ca sad-aśvāṁś ca svalaṁkṛtān* | *rathāṁś ca dāntān sauvarṇaiḥ śubhraiḥ paṭṭair alaṁkṛtān* ; *ibid*. 1.247.40 : *vāḍavānāṁ ca śuddhānāṁ candrāṁśu-sama-varcasām* | *dadau Janārdanaḥ prītyā sahasraṁ hema-bhūṣitam*.

1.156.2 : *yaḥ pūrvyāya vedhase navīyase*
sumaj-jānaye viṣṇave dadāśati |
yo jātam asya mahato mahi bravat
sed u śravobhir yujyaṁ cid abhy asat ||

"He who makes offerings to Viṣṇu, the old, very young, wise one, that has a beautiful wife ; he who announces the great birth of this great one, he will surpass even his friend in renown." As observed above, *sumajjāni* is the synonym of *bhadra-jāni* that occurs in 5.61.4 : *parā vīrāsa etana maryāso bhadra-jānayaḥ*, and means 'he who has a beautiful wife.' It is very probable that, in both verses, the beautiful wives are thought of as accompanying their husbands' Geldner's translation of the word as 'dem die Frauen lieb sind' (*RV. Über*., p. 193) seems to me to be incorrect : so far as we know, *-jāni* denotes 'wife' and not 'woman,' and *sumat* does not mean 'lieb.'

2.26.3 : *ameva naḥ suhavā ā hi gantana*
ni barhiṣi sadatanā raṇiṣṭana |

adhā mandasva jujuṣāṇo andhasas
tvaṣṭar devebhir janibhiḥ sumad-gaṇaḥ ||

"Come to us as to your house, O ye that are easy to call (*i.e.*, ye that at once hear our call); sit on the *barhis* and be glad. Rejoice, finding pleasure in the drink, O Tvaṣṭṛ that hast a glorious following of gods and (their) wives." *sumad-gaṇaḥ* is, as already observed, a synonym of *bhadra-vrāta* which occurs in 10.47.5: *bhadra-vratāṁ vipravīraṁ svarṣāṁ.*

3.3.9 : *vibhāvā devaḥ suraṇaḥ pari kṣitīr*
agnir babhūva śavasā sumad-rathaḥ |
tasya vratāni bhūri-poṣiṇo vayam
upa bhūṣema dama ā suvṛktibhiḥ ||

"The bright happiness-bringing god with the beautiful chariot, Agni, has, through his might, encompassed protectingly (all) men. Of him who nourishes many, we shall honour the ordinances with hymns in our dwelling." With regard to *sumad-ratha*, compare the epithets *suratha*, *hiraṇya-ratha*, and *candra-ratha* applied to Agni in 4.2.4: *sv-aśvo agne surathaḥ surādhā ed u vaha suhaviṣe janāya*; 4.1.8: *sa dūto viśved abhi vaṣṭi sadmā hotā hiraṇyaratho raṁsujihvaḥ*; and 1.141.12: *uta naḥ sudyotmā jīrāśvo hotā mandraḥ śṛṇavac candrarathaḥ.*

8.56.5 : *acety agniś cikitur*
havyavāṭ sa sumadrathaḥ |
agniḥ śukreṇa śociṣā •
bṛhat sūro arocata
divi sūryo arocata ||

"Agni, the carrier of offerings, wise, who has a beautiful chariot, has been perceived. Agni shone high (as) the sun with bright light; he shone in heaven (as) the sun."

8.45.39: *ā ta etā vacoyujā*
harī gṛbhṇe sumadrathā |
yad īṁ brahmabhya id dadaḥ ||

"I take hold of these thy two bay horses with the beautiful chariot (*i.e.*, that draw the beautiful chariot), that yoke themselves at word, and that thou gavest to the priests." Compare, in respect of pādas a and b, 7.36.4: *girā ya etā yunajad dharī ta indra priyā rathā śūra dhāyū*; compare also 1.56.1: *dakṣaṁ mahe pāyayate*

hiraṇyayaṁ ratham ā vṛtyāṁ hariyogam ṛbhvasam and other similar passages in which Indra's chariot is described as 'golden.'

1.142.7 : *ā bhandamāne upāke*
naktoṣasā supeśasā |
yahvī ṛtasya mātarā
sīdatāṁ barhir ā sumat ||

"May Night and Dawn, refulgent, near to each other, adorned with jewels, always moving, mothers of *ṛta*, sit on the beautiful *barhis.*" *barhiḥ sumat*='das schöne barhis,' as Geldner (*RV. Über.*) has rightly translated. Compare the expressions *syonaṁ barhiḥ* in 10.110.4, *surabhi bhūtv asme . . barhiḥ* in 10.70.4 and the epithet *su-* in the term *subarhis* which occurs in 1.74.5 and 8.20.25. The meaning of *yahva* is not quite certain and my translation, 'always moving,' is merely tentative.

1.162.7 : *upa prāgāt suman me 'dhāyi manma*
devānām āśā upa vītapṛṣṭhaḥ |
anv enaṁ viprā ṛṣayo madanti
devānāṁ puṣṭe cakṛmā subandhum ||

"He [*sc.* the sacrificial horse] has gone—a fine hymn has been made and offered by me—to the region of the gods, he who has a comfortable back. The inspired seers glorify him. We have made him our mate in the nourishing of the gods." Regarding *sumat manma*, compare the expressions *cārur matiḥ* and *śundhyūr matiḥ* in 9.91.14 : *hṛdā matiṁ janaye cārum agnaye*; 6.8.1 : *vaiśvānarāya matir navyasī śuciḥ soma iva pavate cārur agnaye*; 7.88.1 : *pra śundhyuvaṁ varuṇāya preṣṭhāṁ matiṁ vasiṣṭha mīḷhuṣe bharasva* and the terms *sūkta, suṣṭuti* and *sumati* (for references see Grassmann s.v.) meaning 'beautiful hymn.'

8.87.4 : *pibataṁ somaṁ madhumantam aśvinā*
barhiḥ sīdataṁ sumat |
tā vāvṛdhānā upa suṣṭutiṁ divo
gantaṁ gaurav iveriṇam ||

"Drink, O ye two Aśvins, the sweet Soma juice. Sit on the beautiful *barhis.* Making our hymn glorious, come ye here from heaven (as swiftly) as two buffaloes go to the hole (filled with water; to slake their thirst)." *Iriṇam*=hole (filled with water); see Pischel, *Ved. St.* 2, 224. The tertium comparationis in the simile

here is swiftness; compare 8.4.3: *yathā gauro apā kṛtaṁ tṛṣyann ety avariṇam | āpitve naḥ prapitve tūyam ā gahi kaṇveṣu su sacā piba*. And hence it also becomes plain that it is not to the hymn, *suṣṭuti*, (as Sāyaṇa, Ludwig and Pischel l.c. opine) that the Aśvins are exhorted to come quickly, but to the Soma juice mentioned in pāda a; compare also in this connection 7.69.6: *narā gaureva vidyutaṁ tṛṣāṇā 'smākam adya savanopa yātam;* and 8.35.7-9: *somaṁ sutaṁ mahiṣevā va gacchathaḥ*. The word *suṣṭutim* is to be construed with *vāvṛdhānā* which is used in the causative sense (and *upa* with *gantam*); compare 10.25.10: *matiṁ viprasya vardhayat* and 8.36.7: *indra brahmāṇi vardhayan*. The meaning of the expression *suṣṭutiṁ vāvṛdhānā* is 'making glorious the hymn'; that is, 'making known that the hymn is potent and has achieved its object by bestowing favours upon us.'

5.2.4: *kṣetrād apaśyaṁ sanutaś carantaṁ*
sumad yūthaṁ na puru śobhamānam |
na tā agṛbhrann ajaniṣṭa hi ṣaḥ
paliṅkīr id yuvatayo bhavanti ||

"I saw him very splendid-looking like a noble herd moving away from the field. They (*fem.*) did not seize him, for he was born; the grey-haired women became young." Hymn 5.2, in which this verse occurs, is obscure and very diverse views have been expressed about its import; see Sieg's *Sagenstoffe des RV.*, p. 66 ff.; Oldenberg, SBE 46, 368; and *RV. Noten*, I, 311, and the literature cited therein. I am not therefore at all certain that the translation given above is in conformity with the idea which the poet had in his mind when he composed the above verse. I do not know who are meant by *tāḥ* in pāda c, nor what connection they have with either the 'grey-haired women that became young' (or 'the youthful women that became grey-haired') mentioned in pāda d. The comparison in the first hemistich, too, is obscure; and in fact, Oldenberg, RV. Noten, l. c. doubts whether there *is* a comparison there. Compare, however, Kirātārjunīya 4.10: *upāratāḥ paścima-rātri-gocarād apārayantaḥ patituṁ javena gām | tam utsukāś cakrur avekṣaṇotsukaṁ gavāṁ gaṇāḥ prasnuta-pīvaraudhasaḥ* in which the herds of kine moving away from the fields in which they had grazed (towards home) are described as making Arjuna

'desirous of seeing them,' *i.e.*, as having been 'worthy of being seen' or 'beautiful.' *

10.32.3 : *tad in me chantsad vapuṣo vapuṣṭaraṁ*
putro yaj jānam pitror adhīyati |
jāyā patiṁ vahati vagnunā sumat
puṁsa id bhadro vahatuḥ pariṣkṛtaḥ |

"That the son should remember the birth of his parents,—this has seemed to me more remarkable than what is remarkable. The beautiful wife marries the husband with a shout; a splendid wedding has been made ready for the man." The sense of this verse is not very clear; see Oldenberg, RV. Noten, II, 237. *vapuṣo vapuṣṭaram* = *citrāc citrataram* or most remarkable. *vagnu*, shout, in pāda c, denotes perhaps a 'shout of joy'; and *sumat*, in the same pāda, refers, I conceive, to *jāyā* rather than to *vagnu* as Sāyaṇa and Geldner (Ved. St. 2, 190) opine. It corresponds to *bhadrā vadhūḥ* in 10.27.12 : *bhadrā vadhūr bhavati yat supeśāḥ* and *sumaṅgalīr vadhūḥ* in 10.85.33 : *sumaṅgalīr iyaṁ vadhūr imāṁ sameta paśyata.*

1.73.6 : *ṛtasya hi dhenavo vāvaśānāḥ*
smadūdhnīḥ pīpayanta dyubhaktāḥ |

* One particular beauty that is referred to by the above verse as being worthy of admiration in the herds of cows, is their large udders that were oozing milk. The large udder of the cow is mentioned as a thing of beauty in Raghuvaṁśa 2.18 ; *āpīna-bhārodvahana-prayatnād gṛṣṭir gurutvād vapuṣo narendraḥ* | *ubhāv alaṁcakratur añcitābhyāṁ tapo-vanāvṛtti-pathaṁ gatābhyām* also. In *ibid*, 1.82-84 :

anindyā Nandinī nāma dhenur āvavṛte vanāt ||
lalāṭodayam ābhugnaṁ pallava-snigdha-pāṭalā |
bibhratī śveta-romāṅkaṁ sandhyeva śaśinaṁ navam ||
bhuvaṁ koṣṇena kuṇḍodhnī medhyenāvabhṛthād api |
prasravenābhivarṣantī vatsāloka-pravartinā ||

not only the large udder overflowing with milk, but the white crescent-like white mark on the forehead are mentioned as points of beauty.

The large udder, it may be observed, is associated with the moving away (towards home) from the grazing pasture, because it is only after the cow has grazed its fill that its udder becomes filled with milk and large in size. Hence the express mention of 'moving away from the field' in RV 5.2.4 and in the verses cited above from the Kirātārjunīya and Raghuvaṁśa.

With *sumat* in 5. 2. 4, should be compared the word *anindyā* (Mallinātha : *anindyā praśastā*) in Raghu. 1.82 cited above, and *puṇya-darśanā* in *ibid*, 1.86.

parāvataḥ sumatiṁ bhikṣamāṇā
vi sindhavaḥ samayā sasrur adrim ||

"The lowing milch-cows of ṛta (*i.e.*, that follow ṛta) that are bestowed by heaven and have fine udders, have oozed (milk). Begging for favour from afar, the rivers have burst through the midst of the rocks". *smadūdhnīḥ=śobhanodhnīḥ*, having fine, that is, large, udders; see note on p. 24 above, and compare also Raghuvaṁśa 2.49: *gāḥ koṭiśaḥ sparśayato ghaṭodhnīḥ*. The verse is addressed to Agni and refers to the milch-cows and the waters that are necessary for the offering of oblations. *vāvaśānāḥ* in pāda a is ambiguous; it may mean 'lowing' (as translated above) or 'longing for: eager'. See Ind. Ant. 56, 107 ff.

7.87.3: *pari spaśo varuṇasya smadiṣṭā*
ubhe paśyanti rodasī sumeke |
ṛtāvānaḥ kavayo yajñadhīrāḥ
pracetaso ya iṣayanta manma ||

"The swift-moving spies of Varuṇa survey the two beautiful worlds, Heaven and Earth,—they who inspire thoughts, who are wise, far-seeing, followers of the Law, (and) knowers of the sacrifice". *smadiṣṭāḥ=śobhana-gamanāḥ* as Sāyaṇa has explained; that is, swift-moving. Compare the epithets *bhūrṇayaḥ*, *iṣirāsaḥ* and *svañcaḥ* that are applied to *spaśaḥ* in 9.73.4: *asya spaśo na ni miṣanti bhūrṇayaḥ* and 9.73.9: *rudrāsa eṣām iṣirāso adruhaḥ spaśaḥ svañcaḥ sudṛśo nṛcakṣasaḥ*.

8.25.24: *smadabhīśū kaśāvantā*
viprā naviṣṭhayā matī |
maho vājināv arvantā sacāsanam ||

"O ye wise [Mitra and Varuṇa], I have, through my latest hymn, obtained plenty of wealth and also two fleet racers with beautiful reins and whips". *smad-abhīśu=sv-abhīśu*; compare 8.68.16,18: *surathāṅ ātithigve svabhīśūṅr ārkṣe* | *āśvamedhe supeśasaḥ* || *aiṣu cetad vṛṣaṇvaty antar ṛjreṣv aruṣī* | *svabhīśuḥ kaśāvatī* ||.

The word *viprā* in pāda b has caused some difficulty to the exegetists. Sāyaṇa regards it as accusative dual and explains it as—*viprā viprau medhāvinau* | *medhāvī stotā yathā stutyaṁ devaṁ stutibhiḥ prīṇayati tadvat saṁtoṣakau* ||. So also does Ludwig who however translates the verse as, 'zugleich gewann ich die beiden

[göttlichen] Brāhmaṇa mit hieher gewandtem zügel mit der geiszel in der hand und die beiden groszen kraftvollen renner' and thus makes out that the viprā or two Brāhmaṇas formed part of the gift which the poet received! Grassman (s.v. viprā) and Oldenberg (RV. Noten, I. 83), on the other hand, regard it as feminine instrumental singular (and attribute of matī). It seems to me however that the most natural course by far is to regard it as vocative dual, referring to Mitra and Varuṇa to whom the hymn is addressed; compare for instance 8.68.15: *ṛjrāv indrota ā dade harī ṛkṣasya sūnavi | āśvamedhasya rohitā* and 6.47.22: *prastoka in nu rādhasas ta indra daśa kośayīr daśa vājino dāt* in which the vocative *indra* is used in Dānastutis. Compare also 1.2.9: *kavī no mitrāvaruṇā tuvijātā urukṣayā* and 5.71.2: *viśvasya hi pracetasā varuṇa mitra rājathaḥ* in which the epithets *kavī* and *pracetasā*, meaning *viprā*, are applied to Mitra and Varuṇa and also 6.68.3: *tā gṛṇīhi namasyebhiḥ śūṣaiḥ sumnebhir indrāvaruṇā cakānā | vajreṇānyaḥ śavasā hanti vṛtraṁ siṣakty anyo vṛjaneṣu vipraḥ ||* and 7.88.4,6: *stotāraṁ vipraḥ sudinatve ahnām; yandhi ṣmā vipra stuvate varūtham* in which the epithet *vipra* is applied to Varuṇa.

8.28.2: *varuṇo mitro aryamā*
smadrātiṣāco agnayaḥ |
patnīvanto vaṣaṭkṛtāḥ ||

"Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryamā, the Agnis, with their splendid gifts, and their wives,—to them is *vaṣat* called (*i.e.*, to them are oblations offered)." As already observed, *smadrātiṣācaḥ* is equivalent to *surātayaḥ* occurring in 9.81.4 cited above; and hence it is very probable that the word is here an attribute, not only of the Agnis, but of Mitra, Varuṇa and Aryaman also.

8.34.6: *smatpuraṁdhir na ā gahi*
viśvatodhīr na ūtaye |
divo amuṣya śāsato
divaṁ yaya divāvaso ||

"Come to our help, thou with glorious blessings that hast thoughts on all sides; the rulers of this heaven have gone to heaven, O Divāvasu." The meaning of the second hemistich which forms the refrain of the first fifteen verses of this hymn, is obscure. Sāyaṇa explains it as, *amuṣya amuṣminn indre śāsataḥ śāsati | vibhaktivyatyayaḥ | tatra vayaṁ sukham āsmahe he divāvaso dīptahaviṣ-*

kendra divaṁ svargaṁ yaya yūyaṁ gacchatha | *bahu-vacanaṁ pūjārtham* | *yad vā* | *he divāvaso dyu-nāmakam amuṣya amuṁ lokaṁ śāsanaṁ kurvanto yūyaṁ divaṁ svargaṁ yaya gacchatha* | *atra bahu-vacanaṁ pūjārtham* ||. Grassmann translates it as: "Von jenes Herrschers Himmel kamt ihr (*i.e.*, Indra and his horses) zu dem Feste Tageshell", and Ludwig as, "auf jenes Dyaus befel seid ihr auch [o falben], o Divāvasu, zum himel gegangen." These interpretations are all unsatisfactory and that given by me above is scarcely better though I have adopted in it Oldenberg's suggestion (RV. Noten, II, 105) that *śāsataḥ* is nominative plural and not genitive singular.

1.51.15 : *idaṁ namo vṛsabhāya svarāje*
satyaśuṣmāya tavase 'vāci |
asminn indra vṛjane sarvavīrāḥ
smat sūribhis tava śarman syāma ||

"This adoration (hymn) has been recited for the strong bull, sovereign, whose courage is strong; in this distress, O Indra, may we with all our men and with our noble patrons be in thy protection." *smat sūribhiḥ* (= *bhadraiḥ sūribhiḥ*), fortunate patrons; *i.e.*, noble and rich patrons; compare the epithet *sujāta*, noble, applied to *sūri* in 2.2.11 : *sa no bodhi sahasya praśaṁsyo yasmin sujātā iṣayanta sūrayaḥ* and 5.6.2 : *sam arvanto raghudruvaḥ saṁ sujātāsaḥ sūrayaḥ*, compare also 10.81.6 : *muhyantv anye abhito janāsa ihāsmākaṁ maghavā sūrir astu.* It must be observed however that though I have followed the current practice of Vedic exegetists (Roth, Grassmann, Oldenberg, etc.) in translating the word *sūri* here as 'patron,' I am not satisfied that this is the real meaning of the word. Compare also Geldner (RV. Über., p. 419): "Die eigentliche Bedentung von *sūri* ist noch unsicher."

1.100.13 : *tasya vajraḥ krandati smat svarṣā*
divo na tveṣo ravathaḥ śimīvān |
taṁ sacante sanayas taṁ dhanāni
marutvān no bhavatv indra ūtī ||

"His beautiful thunderbolt, that wins light, roars; the sound is terrible and overpowering like that of Dyaus. Him follow successes and prizes. May Indra with the Maruts come to our help". *smat vajraḥ* = *śobhano vajraḥ*; compare 8.70.2 : *hastāya vajraḥ*

prati dhāyi darśataḥ and 9.97.1 : *eṣa pra kośe madhumāñ acikradad indrasya vajro vapuṣo vapuṣṭaraḥ.* Regarding the simile in pāda b, compare 1.58.2 : *divo na sānuḥ stanayann acikradat ;* 4.10.2 : *pra te divo na stanayanti śuṣmāḥ ;* 7.3.6 : *divo na te tanyatur eti śuṣmaḥ* and similar other verses in which the sound of Dyaus, *i.e.*, thunder, is mentioned as *upamāna.*

1.186.6 : *uta na īṁ tvaṣṭā gantv acchā*
smat sūribhir abhipitve sajoṣāḥ |
ā vṛtrahendraś carṣaniprās
tuviṣṭamo narāṁ na iha gamyāḥ ||

" And may Tvaṣṭṛ also come to us gladly in the evening with the glorious and gracious gods and goddesses. May Indra, the killer of Vṛtra, the strongest of heroes, who fulfils (the expectations of) men, come here." The meaning of *sūri* is, as observed above, uncertain. We know however that it is used to denote the gods (see Grassmann, s.v.) ; and since gods and their wives are mentioned in 2.36.3 explained above and also in 6.50.13 : *tvaṣṭā devebhir janibhiḥ sajoṣāḥ* and 10.64.10 : *tvaṣṭā devebhir janibhiḥ pitā vacaḥ* in connection with Tvaṣṭṛ, I regard the word here as an *ekaśeṣa* referring to gods and their wives.

1.186.8 : *uta na īṁ maruto vṛddhasenāḥ*
smad rodasī samanasaḥ sadantu |
pṛṣadaśvāso 'vanayo na rathā
riśādaso mitrayujo na devāḥ ||

" And may the Maruts also, with a great army (*i.e.*, who are many in number and from a great army by themselves),—the beautiful Rodasī (also)—sit, unanimous, on our (barhis), the gods with spotted horses, whose chariots (move as swiftly) as rivers, who are as difficult to check as those joined with their allies". The translation of pāda d is tentative as the meaning of *riśādasḥ* is not certain. I am however inclined to believe that it means 'swift ; wild ; impetuous ; difficult to check' (compare Pischel in Ved. St. 3,190 ff.) and that the comparison concerns kings on the offensive who have effected a junction with their allies. Compare 1.190.6 : *durniyantuḥ pariprīto na mitraḥ* 'difficult to check like an ally who is well pleased'. *smad rodasī*=*bhadrā rodasī ;* compare the epithet *bhadrajānayaḥ* that is applied to the Maruts in 5.61.4 :

parā vī rāsa etana maryāso bhadrajānayaḥ with reference (presumably) to Rodasī.

2.4.9 : *tvayā yathā gṛtsamadāso agne*
guhā vanvanta uparāṅ abhi ṣyuḥ |
suvīrāso abhimātiṣāhaḥ
smat sūribhyo gṛṇate tad vayo dhāḥ ||

'That the Gṛtsamadas, O Agni, attacking secretly, may, through thee, overcome (their) neighbours (and become) possessed of fine sons (and) conquerors of enemies—bestow such strength on the noble patrons and on the praiser (*i.e.*, priest)". The sense of pāda b is obscure. The epithet *guhā vanvantaḥ* 'attacking or winning secretly' is one that is more suited to the enemies of Agni's worshippers rather than to such worshippers themselves. The verb *as* with *abhi*, too, in the sense of 'overcome' takes generally in the RV. objects like *pṛtanyūn* (3.1.16 : *abhi ṣyāma pṛtanāyūṅr adevān*), *śatrūn* (1.178.5 : *tvayā vayaṁ maghavann indra śatrūn abhi ṣyāma*), *rakṣasaḥ* (10.132.2 : *yuvoḥ krāṇāya sakhyair abhi ṣyāma rakṣasaḥ*), and similar words ; and it is strange to meet with the word *uparān* here as its object. Geldner therefore translates (RV. Über.) the pāda as, 'die Nebenbuhler (?) heimlich überbieten und überwinden' and observes, "*upara* scheint hier und 6.2.11 eine von der sonstigen abweichende Bedeutung zu haben. In 7.48.3 (wo *uparatāti*, vgl. av. *uparatāt*—) spricht ihm *aryaḥ*, also entweder rivalis, Nebenbuhler oder (mehr in Anlehnung an den avest. Sinn von *upara*) überlegen."

5.41.15 : *pade-pade me jarimā ni dhāyi*
varūtrī vā śakrā yā pāyubhiś ca |
siṣaktu mātā mahī rasā naḥ
smat sūribhir ṛjuhasta ṛjuvaniḥ ||

"At every step has old age been placed. May the great mother Rasā, mighty, bestowing beneficent gifts, with beneficent things in her hands, who protects us with protections, help us (and) our noble patrons." *jarimā* in pāda a means perhaps 'long life'; compare 10.59.4 : *dyubhir hito jarimā sū no astu* and Oldenberg's observation thereon (RV. Noten, II, p. 197), '*jariman* wohl in günstigem Sinn als "langes Leben" zu verstehen, vgl. 10.87.21 [*sakhe sakhāyam ajaro jarimṇe 'gne martāṅ amartyas tvaṁ naḥ*].'

Compare also 1.117.25: *uta paśyann aśnuvan dīrgham āyur astam ivej jarimāṇaṁ jagamyām.*

5.41.19: *abhi na iḷā yūthasya mātā*
sman nadībhir urvaśī vā gṛṇātu |
urvaśī vā bṛhaddivā gṛṇānā
'bhyūrṇvānā prabhṛthasyāyoḥ ||

"May Iḷā, mother of the herd, praise us, or Urvaśī with the beautiful rivers, Urvaśī or Bṛhaddivā who is praised and who is surrounded by the offerings of diligent men." *sman nadībhiḥ*=*bhadrābhir nadībhiḥ.* Compare the epithets *citrā, darśatā*, etc., applied to the river Sindhu in 10.75. 7-8: aśvā na citrā vapuṣīva darśatā || svaśvā sindhuḥ surathā suvāsā hiraṇyayī sukṛtā.. yuvatiḥ subhagā.

5.87.8: *adveṣo no maruto gātum etana*
śrotā havam jaritur evayāmarut |
viṣṇor mahaḥ samanyavo yuyotana
smad rathyo na daṁsanā
'pa dveṣāṁsi sanutaḥ ||

"Being favourably inclined, take the way towards us, O Maruts; listen to the call of the praiser (priest). Being of the same mind as the great Viṣṇu (*i.e.*, in combination with the great Viṣṇu), keep away from us, by your wonderful power, (all) evil things, as good charioteers (keep away from difficult roads)." Regarding the simile in pāda d, compare 8.47.5: *pari ṇo vṛṇajann aghā durgāṇi rathyo yathā* "May distresses keep away from us as charioteers keep away from difficult roads." *evāyāmarut* in pāda b occurs as refrain in all verses of the hymn and has been left untranslated by me. It has no connection with the other words of the verses, and seems to be used as a sort of interjection. See PW and Grassmann. *smad rathyaḥ*=*praśastā rathyaḥ* as explained by Sāyaṇa, that is, clever charioteers who know how to drive.

7.3.8: *yā vā te santi dasuṣe adhṛṣṭā*
giro vā yābhir nṛvatīr uruṣyāḥ |
tābhir naḥ sūno sahaso ni pāhi
smat sūrīn jaritṝn jātavedaḥ ||

"The impregnable (citadels) that thou hast for him who makes offerings to thee, or through which thou canst protect hymns with men (*i.e.*, hymns and also the men, that is, us, that recite them),

with them, O son of strength, O Jātavedas, protect us singers (and our) noble patrons." Compare Oldenberg, RV. Noten, II, p. 7. The word *puraḥ*, 'citadels,' has to be understood here after *adhṛṣṭāḥ*; compare 7.15.16: *adhā mahī na āyasy anādhṛṣṭo nṛpītaye | pūr bhavā śatabhujiḥ* and 10.101.8: *puraḥ kṛṇudhvam āyasīr adhṛṣṭāḥ* and also pāda d of the preceding verse: *śataṁ pūrbhir āyasībhir ni pāhi*. Regarding the expression *pūrbhir uruṣyāḥ*, compare 1.58.8: *agne gṛṇantam aṁhasa uruṣyorjo napāt pūrbhir āyasībhiḥ*; and regarding *gira uruṣyāḥ*, compare 10.177.2: *tāṁ dyotamānāṁ svaryaṁ manīṣām ṛtasya pade kavayo ni pānti*; 10.93.11: *etaṁ śaṁsam indra . . . sadā pāhi*; and 7.56.19: *ime* [*sc. marutaḥ*] *śaṁsaṁ vanuṣyato ni pānti*. *smat sūrin*=*bhadrān sūrīn*.

8.18.4: *devebhir devy adite*
'riṣṭabharmann ā gahi |
smat sūribhiḥ purupriye suśarmabhiḥ ||

"Come, O goddess Aditi, very dear, that bringest blessings, with the bright well-protecting gracious gods." Regarding *smat sūribhiḥ*, 'gracious gods,' compare *bhadrā devāḥ* in 10.72.5: *tāṁ devā anv ajāyanta bhadrā amṛtabandhavaḥ*.

8.20.18: *ye cārhanti marutaḥ sudānavaḥ*
sman mīḷhuṣaś caranti ye |
ataś cid ā na upa vasyasā hṛdā
yuvāna ā vavṛdhvam ||

"The liberal ones (*i.e.*, worshippers) who adore the Maruts, who serve (*i.e.*, worship) the gracious ones that rain blessings,—turn, O ye youths, even from thence (*i.e.*, from heaven) towards us with very gracious mind". *sudānavaḥ* is an epithet of worshippers; compare 8.103.7: *aśvaṁ na gīrbhī rathyaṁ sudānavo marmṛjyante devayavaḥ* and 9.74.4: *samīcīnāḥ sudānavaḥ prīṇanti taṁ naraḥ*. *smat*=*bhadrān*; compare the epithet *subhaga* applied to the Maruts in 5.60.6: *yad uttame maruto madhyame vā yad vāvame subhagāso divi ṣṭha*. The epithet *mīḷhuṣaḥ* is applied to the Maruts in 1.173.12 also: *mahaś cid yasya mīḷhuṣo yavyā haviṣmato maruto vandate gīḥ*. *Ye* in the first hemistich seems to have as antecedent *naḥ* in the third pāda.

The words *arhanti* and *caranti* in the first hemistich are perplexing and I follow Sāyaṇa in interpreting them as *pūjayanti*

(cp. 10.77.1 : *sumārutaṁ na brahmāṇam arhase*) and *saparyanti* (cp. the verb *paricar*) respectively. Grassmann (no. 640) translates the hemistich as, "Die reich an Gaben selbst den Maruts kommen gleich, und zu den gnäd' gen gehn im Chor", and Ludwig (no. 702) as, "die Marut; die treflich begabten, die hieher regnend gehn, sie die anspruch haben."

8.26.18-19 : *uta syā śvetayāvarī*
vāhiṣṭhā vāṁ nadīnām |
sindhur hiraṇyavartaniḥ ||
smad etayā sukīrtyā
'śvinā śvetayā dhiyā |
vahethe śubhrayāvānā ||

"And this river Śvetayāvarī with a golden path, that among rivers, flows the best for ye, by this beautiful, well-famed Śvetā, drive with my prayer, O ye Aśvins with a splendid team." *Śvetā*=*Śvetayāvarī*, and *śvetayā*, 'by Śvetā,' means probably 'to the bank of Śvetā,' where, according to Sāyaṇa, the *ṛṣi* was invoking the Aśvins.

10.61.8 : *sa īṁ vṛṣā na phenam asyad ājau*
smad ā paraid apa dabhracetāḥ |
sarat padā na dakṣiṇā parāvṛn
na tā nu me pṛśanyo jagṛbhre ||

This verse, as in fact, the whole hymn in which the verse occurs, is obscure. I translate tentatively, "Like a bull in a race, he threw forth froth ; the handsome one went away weak in mind. He walked with the right foot turned away, as it were, thinking 'The Pṛśanis have not got hold of me'".

The word *smat* occurs further in 10.49.4 (tugraṁ kutsāya smadibhaṁ ca randhayam) in the compound *smadibha* ('having a fine elephant') which is generally regarded as a proper name (PW, Grassmann, Sāyaṇa, Pischel and Geldner in Ved. St., 1, p. xvi.)

The word *sumat* too occurs, further, in the compound *sumadgu* in AV. 5.1.7 and in the compound *sumat-kṣara* in three Praiṣa formulæ (VS. 21.43-45 ; TB. 3.6. 11.1 ; MS. 4.13.7 ; KS. 18.21). AV. 5.1.7. as in fact, the whole of the hymn 5.1, is very obscure (Whitney, in his translation, remarks of it that it is 'intentionally and most successfully obscure'). Whitney has translated *sumadgu* there as 'with kine'; but there seems to be no doubt that it means

'having fine cows,' and that it is the equivalent of *sugu* in RV. 1.125.2: *sugur asat suhiraṇyas svaśvaḥ. sumat-kṣara* (which is an epithet applied to the offering of fat and cooked flesh made to the gods) is explained by Roth (PW) as 'träufelnd, vollsaftig.' This explanation is plainly unsatisfactory, and the word really signifies 'beautifully melting,' that is, 'melting delightfully in the mouth' or 'delicious'.

In conclusion, I would observe that, in the verses in which the words *smat* and *sumat* are used by themselves uncompounded, it is difficult to determine with what word they are to be construed. Thus in 10.32.3, I have construed *sumat* with *jāyā* while Geldner (Ved. St. 2, l. c.) and Sāyaṇa construe it with *vagnunā*. In 2.4.9, Sāyaṇa construes *smat* with *vayaḥ*, and in 1.100.13, with *krandati* while I have construed them with *sūribhyaḥ* and *vajraḥ*. Similarly, it is possible to construe it with *śarman* in 1.51.15 (compare the words *su-śarman* and *su-śaraṇa*) and with *nipāhi* in 7.3.8 (compare *su-gopāh ; su-ūti*). I have therefore in the translations given above construed it in what seemed to me the best way.

(*To be continued.*)

VṚTTAJĀTISAMUCCAYA OF VIRAHĀṄKA.

(A TREATISE ON PRAKRIT METRES.)

BY PROF. H. D. VELANKAR.

The following edition of Virahāṅka's Vṛttajātisamuccaya is based upon the two MSS. of the Society, described by me in the first volume of the Catalogue at p. 38. One of these contains only the text, while the other contains only the commentary.

Our MSS. are not very well written. The scribe was obviously not acquainted with either the Prakrit language or the Jain Nāgarī script in which the original palm MS. seems to have been written. Fortunately, however, the mistakes of the scribe have not very materially obscured the text and besides I got much help from the commentary, though this too is seriously mutilated throughout. Another circumstance which simplified, to a great extent, my task of restoring the text, is that the author, as a rule, employs in the stanzas containing the definitions, those very metres which are defined in them.

In giving the following text, I have corrected only the very obvious mistakes of the manuscripts. Where I thought my corrections were not obvious, *i.e.* neither supported by the commentary nor by the text as given in the MS., nor by metrical reasons, I have given my reasons in the notes.

Out of the six chapters, of which the treatise consists, I am giving for the present only the first four; firstly because the last two chapters are not important from the point of view of Prakrit metres as they contain the rules of Sanskrit metres and the six metrical modifications (cf. below, I. 11-12); and secondly because our MS. does not practically contain the commentary on them.

As regards the date and life of the author Virahāṅka, I am unable to say anything more than what I have said in my Catalogue. The original of our MSS. is dated Saṁ. 1192. This fixes the lower limit of the date of the Commentator. From the condition of the text of the Vṛttajātisamuccaya, which the commentator describes as existing when he undertook to write the

commentary (cf. my Catalogue, pp. 38-39) and from his reference for disapproval, to an earlier explanation of I. 32 and also of some other stanzas, it would not be unreasonable to assume a difference of at least 200 to 300 years between the dates of the Commentator Gopāla and the author of the original text. Thus the author probably lived in the 9th or 10th century A. D. or even earlier. Virahāṅka mentions Piṅgala (IV. 13), Bhujagādhipa (II. 8-9 ; III. 12), Viṣadhara (I. 22, II. 7), Vṛddhakavi (II. 8-9 ; III. 12), Sālāhaṇa (II. 8-9), and Hāla (III. 12). Of these, the first three are the names of the traditional originator of the Chandaśśāstra. According to the Commentator, the 2nd and the 3rd names refer to two persons whom he always calls Kambala and Aśvatara and who were Nāgas. Piṅgala too was Nāga (cf. Piṅgala, Kāvyamāla edition, I. 60, 84,100, etc.). Is Piṅgala one of these ? Vṛddhakavi is Harivṛddha and Sālāhaṇa or Hāla is the king of that name according to the Commentator.

As a rule, Virahāṅka composes his own instances to illustrate the metres defined. The stanza contains both the definition and the illustration of a metre. Only in three cases he obviously quotes from earlier lyric poets; these are IV. 4, 34 and 74-75. It is, of course, not impossible that these too might have been composed by Virahāṅka himself.

Of the metres which usually occur in Apabhraṁśa (cf. Hemacandra, Cchandonuśāsana, Bombay, 1912, p. 35a, line 16ff.) and the vernaculars we have the following :—Aḍilā, (IV. 32), Utphullaka (IV. 63), Khaḍahaḍaka (IV. 73-75), Ḍhosā (IV. 35), Dvipathaka or Dūhā (IV. 27), Mātrā (IV. 29-31), Raḍḍā (IV. 31), Rāsaka (IV. 37-38) and Rāsā (IV. 84) among others.

The following is a brief summary of the contents of the work :—

In the *first* Chapter, after the customary salutation to the deity, the author enumerates the Prakrit metres which are all Mātrā Vṛttas and which are discussed in the first four chapters of the work (vv. 4-11a); he then alludes to the Sanskrit Varṇa Vṛttas and the six metrical modifications which form the subject-matter of the last two chapters (vv. 11b-12). Short and long syllables are next explained and also the signs which should represent them (vv. 13-14). This is followed by an enumeration of all the sub-

divisions of the Caturmātra and Pañcamātra Gaṇas (groups of four and five moras) and a discussion of the names by which they should be known as also of their proper and improper employment in the different metres. The *second* chapter contains only 16 stanzas, the first eight of which teach the formation of Gīti, Vastuka, Vidārī, Ekaka, Dvipathaka, Vistaritaka and Dhruvaka, all of which are required for the construction of a Dvipadī. In the next eight stanzas, the names of the 52 kinds of a Dvipadī are enumerated. In the *third* Chapter, the definitions of these 52 Dvipadis are given while in the *fourth*, the remaining Mātrā Vṛttas are defined.

I am giving a Sanskrit translation of the text with a very few extracts from the commentary. These latter are given in the notes where I have also attempted to explain the difficult portions of the text and compared our definitions with those of Hemacandra and Piṅgala. At the beginning of the notes, again, will be found an alphabetical list of the metres defined in our treatise, and also a glossary of technical terms, which, though explained at I. 13 ff., I have given in an alphabetical order for the sake of easy reference.

In the body of the text, I have given in the margin, the name of the metre with the formula of a Pāda. For the signs used in the formulæ, see the note at the beginning of the Notes.

श्री

विरहाङ्ककृतः वृत्तजातिसमुच्चयः ।

देईं सरस्सइं पणमिऊण गरुअकइ गन्धहत्थिं च ।
सब्भावलञ्छणं पिङ्गलं च अवलेवइण्हं च ॥१॥
[देवीं सरस्वतीं प्रणम्य गुरुकविं गन्धहस्तिं च ।
सद्भावलाञ्छनं पिङ्गलं च अवलेपचिह्नं च ॥१॥]
कामिणिकवोलपह्मपरितणुअबुद्धिविहवो वि दइआए ।
साहइ समुच्चयं विरहलञ्छणो वित्तजाईणम् ॥२॥
[कामिनीकपोलपक्ष्मपरितनुकबुद्धिविभवोऽपि दयितायै ।
कथयति समुच्चयं विरहलाञ्छनो वृत्तजातीनाम् ॥२॥]
जं जियलोए दुविहं मत्तावित्तं च वण्णवित्तं च ।
तस्स मए तुह लक्खेण लक्खणं सीसइ नअङ्गि ॥३॥
[यज्जीवलोके द्विविधं मात्रावृत्तं च वर्णवृत्तं च ।
तस्य मया तुभ्यं लक्ष्येण लक्षणं शिष्यते नताङ्गि ॥३॥]

दुवईगीइअगाहाखन्धअगीइविलासिणीणं च ।
उवगीइणिव्वाइअवाणासिअखञ्जआणं च ॥४॥

[द्विपदी-गीतिक-गाथा-स्कन्धक-गीति-विलासिनीनां च ।
उपगीति-निर्वापिता-वाणासिका-खञ्जकानां च ॥४॥]

परिणन्दिअआणन्दिअकीलणअतरङ्गआण सम्माणम् ।
अहिअक्खरनक्कोडअरमणिज्जअदुवहआणं च ॥५॥

[परिनन्दित-आनन्दित-क्रीडनक-तरङ्गकाणां साम्यानाम् ।
अधिकाक्षरा-नर्कुटक-रमणीयक-द्विपथकानां च ॥५॥]

मागहिआमत्ताणं अडिलारठ्ठाण डोसरूआणम् ।
रासअसीसअतिभलअदण्डअखन्दुग्गआणं च ॥६॥

[मार्गधिका-मात्राणां अडिला-रथ्यानां दोसरूपाणाम् ।
रासक-शीर्षक-त्रिकलक-दण्डक-खण्डोद्गतानां च ॥६॥]

वेआलिअउवछन्दसआवाअलिआण उग्गआणं च ।
कुट्टुम्भअछित्तअभित्तिआण सामुग्गआणं च ॥७॥

[वैतालीय-औपच्छन्दसिक-आपातलिकानां उद्गतानां च ।
कोट्टुम्भक-छित्तक-भित्तकानां सामुद्गकानां च ॥७॥]

गाहस्स सणाराअस्स ललिअभमरावलीकुमुअआणम् ।
उप्फुल्लअसंगअआण बिन्दुतिलआण वीहीणम् ॥८॥

[गाथस्य सनाराचस्य ललिता-भ्रमरावली-कुमुदकानाम् ।
उत्फुल्लक-संगतकानां बिन्दुतिलकानां वीथीनाम् ॥८॥]

ऊलम्बिअचउप्पअएक्काणं तिलअहंसिणीणं च ।
खडहडअखेडआणं सोवाणअसालहञ्जीणम् ॥९॥

[अवलम्बित-चतुष्पद-एककानां तिलक-हंसिनीनां च ।
खडहडक-खेटकानां सोपानक-शालभञ्जीनाम् ॥९॥]

तलतालवेण्ठआणं उग्गीआणं मणोरमाणं च ।
अन्तुल्लअचन्दुज्जोअआण तह रासआणं च ॥१०॥

[तलतालवृन्तकानां उद्गीतानां मनोरमाणां च ।
अन्तुल्लक-चन्द्रोद्योतकानां तथा रासकानां च ॥१०॥

संदाणिअअविसेसअचक्कलआणं च कुलअगलिआणं ।
गोवित्तप्पमुहाणं कमेण तह वण्णवित्ताणम् ॥११॥

[सन्दानितक-विशेषक-चक्कलकानां च कुलक-गलितानाम् ।
गोवृत्तप्रमुखानां क्रमेण तथा वर्णवृत्तानाम् ॥११॥]

सव्वाण पत्थारं णट्ठं दिट्ठं च लहुक्किअं संखम् ।
अद्धाणेण समग्गं कहेमि छप्पच्चए तह अ ॥१२॥

[सर्वेषां प्रस्तारं नष्टोद्दिष्टं च लघुक्रियां संख्याम् ।
अध्वना समग्रं कथयामि षट् प्रत्ययांस्तथा च ॥१२॥]
इतराइं जाण लहुअक्खराइं पाअन्तिमेक्कसहिआण ।
संजोअपढमदीहरसबिन्दुसविसग्गवण्णाण ॥१३॥
[इतराणि जानीहि लघ्वक्षराणि पादान्तिमकसहितेभ्यः ।
संयोगप्रथम-दीर्घ-सबिन्दु-सविसर्गवर्णेभ्यः ॥१३॥]
कुणसु कुडिलोज्जुअग्गं गरुअं अङ्गुट्ठपव्वपरिमाणम् ।
लहुअं च उज्जुअं तित्तिण्णं दइए पमाणेण ॥१४॥
[कुरु कुटिलर्ज्वग्रं गुरुकं अङ्गुष्ठपर्वपरिमाणम् ।
लघुकं च ऋजु तावतैव दयिते प्रमाणेन ॥१४॥]
सव्वन्तमज्झगरुओ पमुहेगरुओ अ सव्वलहुओ अ ।
चउमत्तंसो भणिओ पञ्चविहो छन्दआरेहिं ॥१५॥
[सर्वान्तमध्यगुरवः प्रमुखेगुरुश्च सर्वलघुकश्च ।
चतुर्मात्रांशो भणितः पञ्चविधश्छन्दस्कारैः ॥१५॥]
पढमलहू बीअलहू चउत्थगरुओ अ तइअलहुओ अ ।
तइअबीअगरुआ पमुहगरू सव्वलहुओ अ ॥१६॥
[प्रथमलघुर्द्वितीयलघुः चतुर्थगुरुश्च तृतीयलघुकश्च ।
तृतीयकद्वितीयकगुरू प्रमुखगुरुः सर्वलघुकश्च ॥१६॥]
गअरहतुरङ्गपाइक्कजोहनामेहिं जाण चउमत्तम् ।
बहुविविहपहरणाणं च पञ्चमत्तं पिहुलसोणि ॥१७॥
[गजरथतुरङ्गपदातियोधनामभिः जानीहि चतुर्मात्रम् ।
बहुविविधप्रहरणानां च पञ्चमात्रं पृथुलश्रोणि ॥१७॥]
कण्णकरपओहरचलणविप्पनामाइं जाणसु इमाइं ।
अन्नाइं वि चउमत्तंसआण दइए जहासंखम् ॥१८॥
गुरुसव्व कण्ण; गुरुअन्त करअलं; पओहरं च गुरुमज्झम् ।
आइगरुअं च चलणं विप्पं सवत्तलहुएहिं ॥१९॥
[कर्ण-कर-पयोधर-चरण-विप्रनामानि जानीहि इमानि ।
अन्यान्यपि चतुर्मात्रांशकानां दयिते यथासंख्यम् ॥१८॥
सर्वगुरुः कर्णोऽन्तगुरुः करतलं पयोधरश्च मध्यगुरुः ।
आदिगुरुश्च चरणः विप्रः सर्वत्र लघुकैः ॥१९॥]
एआणं विअ मज्झे गुरुमज्झंसस्स जाण अण्णं वि ।
आअरणिरूविअं संणअङ्गि नामं नरेन्दोत्ति ॥२०॥
[एतेषामेव मध्ये गुरुमध्यांशस्य जानीहि अन्यदपि ।
आदरनिरूपितं संनताङ्गि नाम नरेन्द्र इति ॥२०॥]

ठाणट्ठिओ पसाहइ ठाणअरहिओ (अ) जेण विनडेइ ।
मज्जाअं पि न लङ्घइ तेण गुरुमज्झओ राआ ॥२१॥
[स्थानस्थितः प्रसाधयति स्थानकरहितश्च येन विकोपयति ।
मर्यादामपि न लङ्घयति तेन गुरुमध्यो राजा ॥२१॥]
सामण्णेहिं पउञ्जइ चउमत्तो जत्थ सुअणु नामेहिं ।
तत्थ नरेन्दो न निउजइत्ति भणिअं विसहरेहिं ॥२२॥
[सामान्यैः प्रयुज्यते चतुर्मात्रो यत्र सुतनु नामभिः ।
तत्र नरेन्द्रो न नियुज्यत इति भणितं विषधराभ्याम् ॥२२॥]
गाहाखन्धअगीईउवगीईगीइआण अ नरिन्दो ।
चउमत्तंसअगणणागओवि विसमे ण ठाणम्मि ॥२३॥
[गाथास्कन्धकगीत्युपगीतिगीतिकानां च नरेन्द्रो ।
चतुर्मात्रांशगणनागतोपि विषमे न स्थाने ॥२३॥]
उवगीईरहिआणं छट्ठे ठाणम्मि दिज्जई दिउवि ।
एआणं विअ वसुहाहिवस्स दइए अलाहम्मि ॥२४॥
[उपगीतिरहितानां षष्ठे स्थाने दीयते द्विजोऽपि ।
एतासामेव वसुधाधिपस्य दयिते अलाभे ॥२४॥]
छट्ठिअविप्पवरे पढमे वण्णम्मि कुणसु निच्चपअम् ।
अह पञ्चमेवि बीए तो से परिहरसु मुहवण्णम् ॥२५॥
[षष्ठस्थितविप्रवरे प्रथमे वर्णे कुरुष्व नित्यपदम् ।
अथ पञ्चमेपि द्वितीये ततोस्य परिहर मुखवर्णम् ॥२५॥]
अहिअक्खरणिव्वाइअबाणासिअसीसआण अ नरिन्दो ।
न विरुज्झइ निच्चंचिअ दइए विसमेसु ठाणेसु ॥ २६ ॥
[अधिकाक्षर-निर्वापितबाणासिकशीर्षकानां च नरेन्द्रः ।
न विरुध्यते नित्यमेव दयिते विषमेषु स्थानेषु ॥ २६ ॥]
जाणसु अ जहासंखं सुरगअ-गरुल-हुअइन्दनामेहिं ।
तिण्णिवि विरामगरुआ छाओअरि पञ्चमत्तंसे ॥ २७ ॥
[जानीहि च यथासंख्यं सुरगज-गरुड-भुजगेन्द्रनामभिः ।
त्रीनपि विरामगुरुकान् शातोदरि पञ्चमात्रांशान् ॥ २७ ॥]
गुरुअक्खरं विआणसु मणिरअणाहरणचमरणामेहिं ।
धअवडअकअलिआणं अन्तेगरुअं तिमत्तं च ॥ २८ ॥
[गुर्वक्षरं विजानीहि मणि-रत्न-आभरण-चमरनामभिः ।
ध्वजपटक-कदलिकानां अन्तगुरुं त्रिमात्रं च ॥ २८ ॥]
तूरविसेसा तिलहुअगणस्स दुलहुअगणस्स रसभावा ।
लहुअस्स वि सद्दफरिसरसरूवगन्धाइं नामाइं ॥ २९ ॥

[तुर्यविशेषात्रिलघुकगणस्य, द्विलघुकगणस्य रसभावाः ।
लघुकस्यापि शब्द-स्पर्श-स्व-रूप-गन्धानि नामानि ॥ २९ ॥

निव्वाइअअहिअक्खरगणसमदुवईण सीसआणं च ।
मज्झलहु चउत्थगुरू अ गीइआणं विअ हिअंसा ॥ ३० ॥
[निर्वापित–अधिकाक्षर–गणसमद्विपदीनां शीर्षकाणां च ।
मध्यलघुश्चतुर्थगुरुश्च गीतिकानामपि च हितांशौ ॥ ३० ॥]

एकदुमत्तब्भहिओ हीणोविअ संसिओ विसहरेहिं ।
पाओ सत्तण्हवि गणसमाण दुवईण पसअच्छि ॥ ३१ ॥
[एकद्विमात्राभ्यधिको हीनोऽपि च शंसितो विषधराभ्याम् ।
पादः सप्तानामपि गणसमानां द्विपदीनां प्रसृताक्षि ॥ ३१ ॥

समरं समोत्ति अ समे विसमम्मि य सायरोत्ति विसमोत्ति ।
पाओ गणो व्व ठाणे भणइए सुअणु वित्ताण ॥ ३२ ॥
[समरः सम इति च समे विषमे च सागर इति विषम इति ।
पादो गणो वा स्थानं भण्यते सुतनु वृत्तानाम् ॥ ३२ ॥]

मन्तित्ति भण्णई जहिं पुरोहिओत्ति अ निउज्जए जम्मि ।
चउमत्तपञ्चमत्ताण दोण्ह जोच्चेअ पडिहाई ॥ ३३ ॥
[मन्त्रीति भण्यते यत्र पुरोहित इति च नियुज्यते यस्मिन् ।
चतुर्मात्रपञ्चमात्रयोर्द्वयोर्य एव प्रतिभाति ॥ ३३ ॥]

इअ कइसिट्ठवित्तजाईसमुच्चए पढमो नियमो संमत्तो ।
[इति कविशिष्टवृत्तजातिसमुच्चये प्रथमो नियमः समाप्तः ।]

II

[For technical words, cf. I. 17–33 and Glossary.]

कीरइ गणेहिं पाओ पाआ चत्तारि वत्थअं भणिअम् ।
चत्तारि सगीइअवत्थआइं दुवइत्ति निद्दिट्ठा ॥ १ ॥
[क्रियते गणैः पादः पादाश्चत्वारो वस्तुकं भणितम् ।
चत्वारि सगीतिकवस्तुकानि द्विपदीति निर्दिष्टा ॥ १ ॥]

तइअधणु; मणिविरमअं; सत्तमसर; छठ्ठराअविप्पं च ।
परिसेसनिहिअजोहं गीइअ पुव्वद्ध पच्छिमद्धं च ॥ २ ॥
[तृतीयधनुष्कं, मणिविरामकं, सप्तमशरं, षष्ठराजविप्रं च ।
परिशेषनिहितयोधं गीतेः पूर्वार्धे पश्चिमार्धे च ॥ २ ॥]

बीअचउत्थेसु सरो पञ्चमपढमेसु सत्तिदण्डो अ ।
भणिएसु रहेसु वि गीइआइ ठाणेसु अविरुद्धा ॥ ३ ॥
[द्वितीयचतुर्थयोः शरः पञ्चमप्रथमयोः शक्तिदण्डौ च ।
भणितेष्वपि रथेष्वपि गीतिकायाः स्थानेष्वविरुद्धाः ॥ ३ ॥]

वत्थअगीइअमज्झे वेआरी एक्कअं दुवहअं च ।
वित्थारिअअं च कईहिं कीरए सुअणु तह अ अत्थाए ॥ ४ ॥
[वस्तुकगीतिकमध्ये विचारी एक्ककं द्विपथकं च ।
विस्तारितकं च कविभिः क्रियते सुतनु तथा च अर्थवशात् ॥४॥]
जा वत्थुआइ लहुई सा वेआरीत्ति भणिआ (सण्णिआ) छन्दे ।
दो पाआ भण्णइ दुवहउत्ति तह एक्कअं एक्को ॥ ५ ॥
[या वस्तुकालध्वी सा विदारीति संज्ञिता छन्दसि ।
द्वौ पादौ भण्यते द्विपथकमिति तथा एक्ककं एकः ॥ ५ ॥]
दुवईण जो ण छन्दो सारिच्छं वहइ जं च दुअईण ।
महुरं च कइअएहिं वित्थारिअअंति तं जाण ॥ ६ ॥
[द्विपदीनां यत्र छन्दसि सादृश्यं वहति; यच्च द्विपदीनाम् ।
मधुरं च कृतककैर्विस्तारितकमिति तज्जानीहि ॥ ६ ॥
जा अवलम्बइ चउवत्थुआण अत्थं पुणो पुणो भणिआ ।
वेआरिव्विअ सा विसहरेहिं धुवइत्ति निद्दिट्ठा ॥ ७ ॥
[या अवलम्बते चतुर्वस्तुकानामर्थं पुनः पुनर्भणिता ।
विचार्येवासौ विषधराभ्यां ध्रुवकेति निर्दिष्टा ॥ ७ ॥]
भुअआहिवसालाहणवुड्ढकई(हिं)णिरूविअं दइए ।
णिहणणिरूविअधुवअम्मि वत्थुए गीइया णत्थि ॥ ८ ॥
[भुजगाधिपसातवाहनवृद्धकविभिर्निरूपितं दयिते ।
निधननिरूपितध्रुवके वस्तुके गीतिका नास्ति ॥ ८ ॥]
भुअआहिवसालाहणवुड्ढकइणिरूविआण दुवईण ।
णामाइं जाइं साहेमि तुज्झ ताईंविअ कमेण ॥ ९ ॥
[भुजगाधिप-सातवाहन-वृद्धकविनिरूपानां द्विपदीनाम् ।
नामानि यानि साधयामि तव तान्येव क्रमेण ॥ ९ ॥]
सुमणा तारा जोण्हा मणोवई कोमुई पगीआ अ ।
रत्ता अ माणिणी अच्छरा अ तह पउमिणी विज्जू ॥ १० ॥
[सुमनास्तारा ज्योत्स्ना मनोवती कौमुदी प्रगीता च ।
रक्ता च मानिनी अप्सराश्च तथा पद्मिनी विद्युत् ॥ १० ॥]
विणया सरस्सई सुप्पहा विहूई सुमङ्गला चन्दा ।
विअआ पहावई णंदिणी सिरी चन्दकन्ता अ ॥ ११ ॥
[विनया सरस्वती सुप्रभा विभूतिः सुमङ्गला चन्द्रा ।
विजया प्रभावती नान्दिनी श्रीः चन्द्रकान्ता च ॥ ११ ॥]
हंसी पंत्था रहआ सुम्मा सामा विलासिणी लच्छी ।
मेहा अस्सकन्ता सुसंगआ मालई दूई ॥ १२ ॥

[हंसी पथ्या रचिता सौम्या श्यामा विलासिनी लक्ष्मीः ।
मेधा अश्वाक्रान्ता सुसंगता मालती द्रुतिका ॥ १२ ॥]
वणराई वंसत्था ससिवअणे रअणमाला अ ।
सत्तत्तीसा एआ जाणह **मत्तागणसमाओ** ॥ १३ ॥
[वनराजिर्वंशस्था शशिवदने रत्नमाला च ।
सप्तत्रिंशदेताः जानीहि मात्रागणसमाः ॥ १३ ॥]
चित्ता सिद्धी भद्दा गन्धारी मालिणी तहा कद्दू ।
ललिआइ समं सत्तावे इमाउ दइए **गणसमाओ** ॥ १४ ॥
[चित्रा सिद्धिर्भद्रा गान्धारी मालिनी तथा कद्रूः ।
ललितया समं सप्तापि इमा दयिते गणसमाः ॥१४॥]
विउला धवला सुमुही अ सारसी भामिणी पसण्णा अ ।
नंदा सेआ अ पिए **अद्धसमाओ** इमा अट्ठ ॥१५॥
[विपुला धवला सुमुखी च सारसी भामिनी प्रसन्ना च ।
नन्दा श्वेता च प्रिये अर्धसमा इमा अष्टौ ॥ १५ ॥]
विसमा तणुमज्झा कोपणा अणत्थी अ विस्सरूआ अ ।
अविसिट्ठलक्खणाओ एआओ मए ण भणिआओ ॥ १६ ॥
[विषमा तनुमध्या कोपना च अनर्थी च विश्वरूपा च ।
अविशिष्टलक्षणा एता मया न भणिताः ॥ १६ ॥]
उद्देसलक्खणणामाइं दुवईणम् । इअ कइसिट्ठवित्तजाईसमुच्चए बिइओ णिअमो संमत्तो ।
[उद्देशलक्षणनामानि द्विपदीनाम् । इति कविशिष्टवृत्तजातिसमुच्चये द्वितीयो नियमः समाप्तः ।]

III.

[For technical words, cf. I. 17-33 and Glossary.]

सुमना:

S.N. = See notes.

कुण करकण्णविवज्जिअअं दुण्ह गआण तुरंगमअम् ।
पुरऊ चारु सचामरअं सुमणापाअ मणोहरअम् ॥ १ ॥
[कुरु करकर्णविवर्जितं द्वयोर्गजयोस्तुरंगमम् ।
पुरतश्चारु सचामरं सुमनापादं मनोहरम् ॥ १ ॥]

तारा 4+4+ISI+S.

सतुरंगरहो णरिन्दओ । विलसन्तमहग्घहारओ ।
सुमणोहरअम्मि मुद्धिए । दीसइ ताराइ पाअए ॥ २ ॥

[सतुरङ्गरथो नरेन्द्रो । विलसन्महार्घहारः
सुमनोहरे सुगन्धिके । दृश्यते तारायाः पादे ॥ २ ॥]

ज्योत्स्ना 5+5+IS.

जीअ पेच्छसि रहङ्गअं । चावअं च सवडाअअम् ।
तं विआण इह छन्दए । जोण्हिएत्ति पसअच्छिए ॥ ३ ॥
[यस्याः पश्यसि रथाङ्गकं । चापं च सपताकम् ।
तं विजानीहि इह च्छन्दसि ज्योत्स्निकेति प्रसृताक्षि ॥ ३ ॥]

मनोवती 4+5+S.

पुरओ जोहअस्स । चारु सचावअस्स ।
पाओ मणोवइए । सोहइ नेउरेणम् ॥ ४ ॥
[पुरतो योधस्य । चारु सचापकस्य ।
पादो मनोवत्याः । शोभते नूपुरेण ॥ ४ ॥]

कौमुदी 5+5+IIS.

पिच्छ पिच्छ छअऊअरिए । अह सबाणससरासणओ ।
कोमुईअ कहि सोहिअओ । विरमईअ पाअस्स करो ॥ ५ ॥
[पश्य पश्य शातोदरिके । अथ सबाणः सशरासनः ।
कौमुद्याः कथं शोभितः । विरामे पादस्य करः ॥ ५ ॥]

प्रगीता 4+4+SS.

अह सतुरंगमएणं । सुन्दरि सन्दणएणं ।
दोहिं अ नेउरएहिं । सोहइ सुट्ठु पगीया ॥ ६ ॥
[अथ सतुरङ्गमेण सुन्दरि स्यन्दनेन ।
द्वाभ्यां च नूपुराभ्यां शोभते सुष्ठु प्रगीता ॥ ६ ॥]

रक्ता SIS+ISI+S.

पिच्छ पक्खिणाहअं । पत्थिवं च बीअअम् ।
रत्तिआइ पाअए । चारुभूसणिल्लिए ॥ ७ ॥
[पश्य पक्षिनाथं । पार्थिवं च द्वितीयम् ।
रक्तिकायाः पादे । चारुभूषणवत्याः ॥ ७ ॥]

मानिनी SIS+ISI+SS.

रत्तिआई पाअअम्मि । नेउरं च दिण्णमन्ते ।
माणिणीअ रूवअं तं । दाविअं खु पाअडं ते ॥ ८ ॥
[रक्तिकायाः पादे । नूपुरं च दत्तमन्ते ।
मानिन्याः रूपकं तत् । दर्शितं खलु प्रकटं ते ॥ ८ ॥]

अप्सरा : 5+5+ISI+S.

किं न देसि दिठ्ठि (सं)णअङ्गिए
अह सबाणचावे णरिन्दए।
अच्छराइ फुडणेउरिल्लिए
पाअअम्मि पसअच्छि लग्गए ॥ ९ ॥
[किं न ददासि दृष्टिं (सं)नताङ्गिके । अथ सबाणचापे नरेन्द्रे ।
अप्सरसः स्फुटनूपुरवति । पादे प्रसृताक्षि लग्ने ॥ ९ ॥]

पद्मिनी (S. N.) 4+4+5+S.

अविरुद्धबीअपत्थिवेसु । पसअच्छि दोसु जोहएसु ।
दिण्णेसु देसु पोमिणीए । पाअम्मि चावचामराइं ॥ १० ॥
[अविरुद्धद्वितीयपार्थिवयोः । प्रसृताक्षि देहि योधयोः ।
दत्तयोः देहि पादयोः । पादे चापचामरं च ॥ १० ॥]

विद्युत् 4+5+4+4 or 4+4+4+5.

दे विज्जुआइ पाअघडिआणं
इह इच्छा तिण्ह तुरंगमाणम् ।
पढमतईअआण विअसिअच्छि
पुरऊ एक्कस्स सुवण्णचावम् ॥ ११ ॥
[देहि विद्युतः पादघटितानामिहेच्छया त्रयाणां तुरङ्गमाणाम् ।
प्रथमतृतीययोर्विकासिताक्षि पुरत एकस्य सुवर्णचापम् ॥ ११ ॥]

विनता 4+ISI+4+ISI+4+ISI+5+S.

थोरोरु हालभुजइन्दविद्धकुइलक्खणेसु सिद्धआए
विणआइ हारिवहुवण्णदिण्णसोहम्मि देसु पाअअम्मि ।
हत्थेण णिज्जिआसोअमुद्धसहआरपल्लविल्लएणं
सतुरंगपत्थिवतिअस्स चारु पुरऊ धणुं च रअणअं च ॥ १२ ॥
[स्थविरोरु हालभुजगेन्द्रवृद्धकाविलक्षणेषु सिद्धायाः
विनतायाः हारिवहुवर्णदत्तशोभे देहि पादे ।
हस्तेन निर्जिताशोकमुग्धसहकारपल्लवेन
सतुरङ्गपार्थिवत्रिकस्य चारु पुरतो धनुश्च रत्नं च ॥ १२ ॥]

सरस्वती 4+5+5+IS.

सन्दणपुरऊ अ दोणि बाणआ
ताण पुरिल्लआ वेअअन्तिआ ।
कण्णसुहावहे जीअ पाअए
पङ्कअवअणिए सा सरस्सई ॥ १३ ॥

[स्यन्दनपुरतो द्वौ वाणा । तयोः पुरस्तात् वैजयन्तिका ।
कर्णसुखावहे यस्याः पादे । पङ्कजवदनिके सा सरस्वती ॥ १३ ॥

सुप्रभा 4+5+4+4+IS.

जीसे जोहअं चाव अ माअङ्गअं
पेछसि पाअए तुरअं च चउत्थअम् ।
विरमणिउत्तअं जीसे अ धअग्गअं
भण्णइ छन्दए सा सुन्दरि सुप्पहा ॥ १४ ॥

[यस्याः योधं चापं च मातङ्गं च । पश्यसि पादे तुरगं च चतुर्थम् ।
विरामनियुक्तं यस्याश्च ध्वजाग्रम् । भण्यते छन्दसि सा सुन्दरि सुप्रभा ॥ १४ ॥]

विभूति 4+ISI+4+5.

वारणणरेन्दसन्दणबाणए
जीसे कमेण पाअणिउत्तए ।
पेच्छसि ससिस्स संणिहवअणिए
जाणसु णअङ्गि तं व विहूइअम् ॥ १५ ॥

[वारणनरेन्द्रस्यन्दनत्राणान् । यस्याः क्रमेण पादनियुक्तान् ।
पश्यसि शशिनः संनिभवदनिके । जानीहि नताङ्गि तामेव विभूतिम् ॥ १५ ॥]

सुमङ्गला 4+4+4+4+S.

वारणजोहरहतुरंगमएहिं
विरमपरिट्ठविअविहूसणएहिं ।
पाओ दूरं सुमणोहरिआए
होइ अ सोम्ममुहि सुमङ्गलिआए ॥ १६ ॥

[वारणयोधरथतुरङ्गमैः । विरामपरिस्थापितविभूषणैः ।
पादो दूरं सुमनोहरायाः भवति च सौम्यमुखि सुमङ्गलायाः ॥१६॥]

चन्द्रिका 5+5+4+S.

ठविअएसु सरतोमरएसु
दे ठवेसु पसअच्छि तुरंगम् ।
चन्दिआइ वण्णुज्जलअम्मि
पाअअम्मि फुडणेउरअम्मि ॥ १७ ॥

[स्थापितयोः शरतोमरयोः । देहि स्थापय प्रसृताक्षि तुरङ्गम् ।
चन्द्रिकायाः वर्णोज्वले । पादे स्फुटनूपुरे ॥ १७ ॥]

विजया 4+4+4+ISI+S.

विअआइ पिए छअऊअरिल्लिए
ठविअम्मि ठवेसु विसालणित्तिए ।
सतुरंगजुअम्मि रहे णरिन्दअं
पुरऊ दिण्णुज्जलपउमराअअम् ॥ १८ ॥
[विजयायाः प्रिये शातोदरि । स्थापिते रथाय विशालनेत्रिके ।
सतुरङ्गयुगे रथे नरेन्द्रं । पुरतो दत्तोज्वलपद्मरागम् ॥ १८ ॥]

प्रभावती ISI+4+ISI+4+IS.

सकण्णआण रसिए सुइसुहावहे
मणोहरे सुललिए कुणसु पाअए ।
पहावईअ विउणे थणतुरंगए
णअङ्गिए विरमए धअवडाअअम् ॥ १९ ॥
[सकर्णानां रसिके श्रुतिसुखावहे । मनोहरे सुललिते कुरु पादे ।
प्रभावत्याः द्विगुणौ स्तनतुरङ्गौ । नताङ्गि विरामे ध्वजपताकाम् ॥१९॥]

नन्दिनी IIS+IIS+IIS+IIS.

सुविअड्ढकईण सुहावणिए
ललिअक्खरपन्तिपसाहणिए ।
कुण णन्दिणिपाअमणोहरिए
रसणेउरआण जुअस्स जुअम् ॥ २० ॥
[सुविदग्धकवीनां सुखापणिके । ललिताक्षरपङ्क्तिप्रसाधनिके ।
कुरु नन्दिनीमनोहरपादे. । रसनूपुरयोर्युगस्य युगम् ॥ २० ॥]

श्री IIS+IIS+IIS+IIS+IIS.

दइए छअऊअरि पीणपऊहरिए
सिरिआअ ठवेसु मियङ्कसमाणणिए ।
रसणेउरआण जुअस्स जुअम्मि ठिए
फरिसं च रवंच विरामविहूसणअम् ॥ २१ ॥
[दयिते शातोदरि पीनपयोधरे । श्रियः स्थापय मृगाङ्कसमानने ।
रसनूपुरयोर्युगस्य युगे स्थिते । स्पर्शं च रवंच विरामविभूषणम् ॥२१॥

चन्द्रकान्ता 4+5+4+IIS.

चन्दकन्तिआ मुहवारणिया
करवीसान्तिआ वीआउहिआ ।
तइअतुरंगिआ इह लक्खणए
पङ्कअवअणिए तुह दावियआ ॥ २२ ॥

[चन्द्रकान्ता मुखवारणिका । करविश्रान्तिका द्वितीयायुधिका ।
तृतीयतुरङ्गा इह लक्षणे । पङ्कजवदने तव दर्शिता ॥ २२ ॥]

हंसी 4+5+4+5+S.

वारणवाणअं जोहो चावअं च
ताण पुरिल्लअं कुण पालम्बअं च ।
जाणसु मुद्धिए भुअअणिउत्तअम्मि
सवणसुहावहे हंसीपाअअम्मि ॥ २३ ॥

[वारणवाणौ योधश्चापं च । तेषां पुरस्तात्कुरु प्रालम्बकं च ।
जानीहि मुग्धे भुजगनियुक्ते । श्रवणसुखावहे हंसीपादे ॥ २३ ॥]

पथ्या 4+4+4+5+IS.

एक्को वारणओ बीओ तुरंगओ
तइओ सन्दणओ वाणो चउत्थओ ।
पञ्चमअं च पुणो जीसे धअग्गअं
सा जइ पाअडिआ पच्छा पिअल्लिए ॥ २४ ॥

[एको वारणो द्वितीयस्तुरङ्गः। तृतीयः स्यन्दनो बाणश्चतुर्थः ।
पञ्चमं च पुनर्यस्या ध्वजाग्रं । स यदि प्रकटिता पथ्या प्रिये ॥ २४ ॥]

रचिता 4+5+5+IIS+IIS+ISI+S.

जीअ तुरंगवाणबाणासणपाणिजुअं णरिन्दओ
होइअ पाअअम्मि चन्दुज्जलओ विरमम्मि हारओ ।
तं थोरोरु लडहबाहूलइए मअमुद्धअच्छिए
जाणसु छन्दअम्मि रइअत्ति पिए महुरक्खरिल्लिए ॥ २५ ॥

[यस्याः तुरङ्गवाणवाणासनपाणियुगं नरेन्द्रः
भवति च पादे चन्द्रोज्वलो विरामे हारः ।
तं स्थूलोरु लडहबाहुलतिके मृगमुग्धाक्षि
जानीहि छन्दसि रचितेति प्रिये मधुराक्षरवति ॥ २५ ॥]
करअलजुअलस्स पिए रइयापअम्मि सुइसुहवहम्मि ।
सन्दणओ ण विरुज्झइ पत्थिवठाणम्मि विप्पउ वा ॥ २६ ॥

[करतलयुगलस्य प्रिये रचितापादे श्रुतिसुखावहे ।
स्यन्दनो न विरुध्यते पार्थिवस्थाने विप्रो वा ॥]
रइयाभेअविसेसदंसणत्थे गीइया । [रचिताभेदविशेषदर्शनार्थं गीतिः ।]

सौम्या 5+5+4+4+IS.

सत्तिदण्डबाणाण ठवेसु पुरिल्लअं
जोहं च तुरंगं च पिए सधअग्गअम् ।
सोम्मिआइ सोम्माणणतुलिअमियङ्किए
पाअअम्मि सुमणोहरअम्मि पिअल्लिए ॥१७॥
[शक्तिदण्डबाणयोः स्थापय पुरस्तात् । योधं च तुरंगं च प्रिये सध्वजाग्रम् ।
सौम्यायाः सौम्याननतुलितमृगाङ्के । पादे सुमनोहरे प्रिये ॥२७॥]

श्यामा 5+5+4+4+ISS.

पढमबाणबीआसणितइअतुरंगमस्स
कयचउत्थरहपञ्चमफुडधयवट्टअस्स ।
सुम्मिआइ पाअस्स विरामणिउत्तएणं
होइअ सुअणु नाम सामेत्ति विहूसणेणम् ॥२८॥
[प्रथमबाणद्वितीयाशनितृतीयतुरङ्गमस्य
कृतचतुर्थरथपञ्चमस्फुटध्वजपट्टकस्य ।
सौम्यायाः पादस्य विरामनियुक्तेन
भवति सुतनु नाम श्यामेति विभूषणेन ॥२८॥]

विलासिनी 4+4+4+4+4+4+5+S.

पञ्चमछट्ठिअपाअक्कअसत्तमठविअरहङ्गिआए
तइअचउत्थअकअमाअङ्गअविरमणिरूविअरअणिआए ।
पढमट्ठाणणिउत्ततुरंगमबीयपरिट्ठिअजोहियाए
कस्स सुहाइ ण वड्ढइ हरिसो सुअणु विलासिणिदुवइआए ॥२९॥
[पञ्चमषष्ठस्थितपदातिकसप्तमस्थापितरथाङ्गिकया
तृतीयचतुर्थकृतमातङ्गकविरामनिरूपितरत्निकया ।
प्रथमस्थाननियुक्ततुरंगमद्वितीयपरिस्थितयोधिकया
कस्य सुहासि न वर्धते हर्षः सुतनु विलासिनीद्विपद्या ॥२९॥]

लक्ष्मी (S. N.) 4+5+5+5+ISS.

णिअमिअअं खुरप्पअं च पुरउ अ जोहअस्स
पट्टिसऊ रहङ्गअं मग्गऊ सुरगअस्स ।
पेच्छ ससिसमाणणे रूवमुच्छुअं पाए अ
सहिआण सुहसुहअम्मि मुद्धिए लच्छिआए ॥३०॥

[नियमितं क्षुरप्रं च पुरतश्च योधस्य
पट्टिशो रथाङ्गं मार्गतः सुरगजस्य ।
पश्य शशिसमानने रूपमुत्सुकं पादे च
सहृदयानां श्रुतिसुखे मुग्धे लक्ष्म्याः ॥३०॥]

मेधा 4+4+4+4+4+ISS.

जीअ दुए वारणआ दो तुरआ जोहओ अ
ताण पुरो णिअमिअओ अन्तिअओ सुरगओअ ।
पेच्छि जसु चन्दवअणीए सुइसुहवत्तणम्मि
लक्खणए कइअणऊ भणई इह मेहअंति ॥३१॥

[यस्या द्वौ वारणौ द्वौ तुरगौ योधश्च
तेषां पुरो नियमितोन्तिमः सुरगजश्च ।
पश्य यस्याश्चन्द्रवदने श्रुतिसुखवर्तके
लक्षणे कविजनो भणति इह मेधेति ॥३१॥]

अश्वाक्रान्ता (S.N.) SII+SII+SII+SII+SII+S.

हाररसाण पिए पुरऊ कुण णेऊरअं
गन्धाविहूसिअए कुण दोणिवि पत्थिवए ।
चारुपऊहरए ठविअम्मि मणोहरए
दूरसमुज्जलअम्मि णिऊंजसु मुद्धडिए ॥३२॥
फरिसं मणि महूए दूरुज्जलवण्णदिण्णसोहम्मि ।
अस्सक्कन्तापाए बहुसहिअअलोअदिण्णहरिसम्मि ॥३३॥

[हाररसयोः प्रिये पुरतः कुरु नूपुरं । गन्धविभूषितौ कुरु द्वौ पार्थिवौ ।
चारुपयोधरे स्थापिते मनोहरे । दूरसमुज्ज्वले नियुंक्ष्व मुग्धे ॥३२॥
स्पर्शं मणिं च मधुरे दूरोज्वलवर्णदत्तशोभे ।
अश्वाक्रान्तापादे बहुसहृदयलोकदत्तहर्षे ॥३३॥]
लक्खणपूरणत्थे गीइआ । [लक्षणपूरणार्थे गीतिः ।]

संगता SII+SII+SII+SII+SII+SII+SII+S.

हाररसाणजुअस्स जुए ठविअम्मिअ दिज्जउ णेउरअं
ठाइ पुणोवि सरूवजुअं कडअं करपल्लवअं च पिए ।
तेसु ठवेसु ससद्दजुअं पसअच्छि णिउञ्जसु चामरअं
संगअपाअमणोहरए विविहोज्जलवण्णपसाहणए ॥३४॥

[हाररसयोर्युगस्य युगे स्थापिते च दीयतां नूपुरं
स्थापय पुनरपि सरूपयुगं कटकं करपल्लवकं च प्रिये ।
तेषु स्थापितेषु सशब्दयुगं प्रसृताक्षि नियुंक्ष्व चामरं
संगतापादे मनोहरे विविधोज्वलवर्णप्रसाधने ॥३४॥]

मालती 4+4+4+4+4+5+S

सतुरंगरहस्स देसु पुरऊ कमेण जोहअस्स
वारणअं मालईअ पाइक्कअं महुरअम्मि ।
विसमट्ठाणअविरुद्धथण-छट्ठकअरहङ्गअम्मि
पाअम्मि वरोरु विरमविलसन्तपउमराअआम्मि ॥३५॥
[सतुरंगरयस्य देहि पुरतः क्रमेण योधस्य । वारणं मालत्याः पदातिं मधुरे।
विषमस्थानाविरुद्धस्तन-षष्ठकृतरथाङ्गे । पादे वरोरु विलसत्पद्मरागे॥३५॥]

द्रुता 4+4+ISI+4+ISI+4.

मुद्धडिए बहुविअड्ढलोअसुसुहाविभाए
पञ्चमअं तइअअं च इह हारिबान्धिआए ।
कुण चउसुवि पाअएसुं महुरक्खरिल्लिआए
हरिरहगयजोहआण णरणाहअं दुवाए ॥३६॥
[मुग्धे बहुविदग्धलोकसुसुखावहायाः ।
पञ्चमं तृतीयं च इह हारिबन्धायाः ।
कुरु चतुर्ष्वपि पादेषु मधुराक्षरवत्याः ।
हरिरथगजयोधानां नरेन्द्रं द्रुतायाः ॥३६॥]

वनराजि 4+5+5+ISI+SS.

पढमतुरंगवीअविणिउत्तवाणआणं
तइअणिरूविआसिसचउत्थपत्थिवाणम् ।
वणराईअ देसु विरमम्मि पाअआणं
णेउरजुअलअं च महुरक्खरिल्लिआणम् ॥ ३७ ॥
[प्रथमतुरंगद्वितीयविनियुक्तवाणानां ।
तृतीयनिरूपितासि-सचतुर्थपार्थिवानाम् ।
वनराज्या देहि विरामे पादानां ।
नूपुरयुगुलं च मधुराक्षरवताम् ॥ ३७ ॥]

वंशस्था 4+5+5+IIS+4+4+IIS.

पढमगइन्दवीअविणिउत्तसरासणए तइआसणिए
कुणसु चउत्थमुद्धकरपल्लवए फुडपञ्चमसन्दणए ।
वंसत्थाइ विरमरसणेउरए कअछट्ठतुरंगमए
पाए पुण्णअन्दसोम्माणणिए बहुवण्णपसाहणिए ॥ ३८ ॥
[प्रथमगजेन्द्र द्वितीयविनियुक्तशरासने तृतीयाशनिके
कुरु चतुर्थमुग्धकरपल्लवे स्फुटपञ्चमस्यन्दने ।
वंशस्थायाः विरामरसनूपुरान् कृतषष्ठतुरंगमे
पादे पूर्णचन्द्रसौम्यानने बहुवर्णप्रसाधने ॥ ३८ ॥]

रत्नमाला 4+5+5+4+IIS.

पढमगइन्दबीअविणिउत्तसरासणए
तइअणिरूविआसिसचउत्थतुरंगमए ।
पाए देसु रअणमालाइ मणोहरअं
पञ्चमअं वरोरु विरामकरपल्लवअम् ॥ ३९ ॥
सत्ततीसा दुवईउ मत्तागणसमाउ समत्ताउ ।

[प्रथमगजेन्द्रद्वितीयविनियुक्तशरासने
तृतीयनिरूपितासि-सचतुर्थतुरंगमे ।
पादे देहि रत्नमालायाः मनोहरं
पञ्चमं वरोरु विरामकरपल्लवम् ॥]
सप्तत्रिंशत् द्विपद्यो मात्रागणसमाः समाप्ताः ।

चित्रा II or S+4+4 (ISI or IIII)+4 or 5+4+5+S.

भूसणअं रसोव्व पमुहे पुणोअ तुरअओअ
तइउ पत्थिवउव्व णिअमेण होइ विप्पउव्व ।
मन्ती अ तु पुणोवि अविरुद्धथणतुरंगओअ
बाणो णेउरंच चित्ताइ सुअणु पाअअम्मि ॥ ४० ॥
[भूषणं रसो वा प्रमुखे पुनश्च तुरगश्च
तृतीयः पार्थिवो वा नियमेन भवति विप्रो वा ।
मन्त्री च तु पुनरपि अविरुद्धस्तनस्तुरंगश्च
बाणो नूपुरंच चित्रायाः सुतनु पादे ॥]

सिद्धि 4 or 5+4 or 5+4 or 5+IS.

तिण्णि पुरोधअआ धअग्गअं
पाएसु चउसुवि विहत्तअम् ।
वयणेण तुलिअससिबिम्बए
सिद्धीअ सआ पसअच्छिए ॥ ४१ ॥
[त्रयः पुरोधसो ध्वजाग्रं । पादेषु चतुर्ष्वपि विभक्तम् ।
वदनेन तुलितशशिबिम्बे । सिद्धेः सदा प्रसृताक्षि ॥४१॥]

भद्रा 4 or 5+4+5+4+4+5.

जीसे होइ पुरोहिओ वारणओ सबाणओ
पाइक्कोअ सजोहओ विरमम्मि सत्तिदण्डओ ।
(पाए) राअहंसगमणिए पञ्चमबीइअठाणए
अविरुद्धभूमिणाहए भद्दित्ति णाम दुवइआ ॥ ४२ ॥
[यस्या भवति पुरोहितो वारणः सबाणः
पदातिश्च सयोधो विरामे शक्तिदण्डः ।

(पादे) राजहंसगमने पञ्चमाद्वितीयस्थानयोः
अविरुद्धभूमिनाथे भद्रेति नाम द्विपदी ॥४२॥]

गन्धारी 4 or 5+4 or 5+ISI or IIII+5.

पमुहम्मि पुरोहिआण जुअलअं
पत्थिवओ विप्पओव्व तइअओ ।
जीसे वि (होइ) चउत्थवाणओ
सा गन्धारित्ति णाम दुवइआ ॥४३॥
[प्रमुखे पुरोहितयोर्युगलं । पार्थिवो विप्रो वा तृतीयः ।
यस्या (भवति) अपि चतुर्थो बाणः । सा गन्धारीति नाम द्विपदी ॥४३॥]

मालिनी 7 Gaṇas of 4 or 5 and S.

जीस पाअए पङ्कअवअणीए दूरअं सवणसुहावहम्मि
सुललिअबन्धए संणअबाहिए मुद्धिए अन्तिमरअणम्मि ।
पढमवीअओअ तइअचउत्थओ पञ्चमछ्ठअ सत्तमो अ
होइ पुरोहिअत्ति विम्बोट्ठिए छन्दअम्मि जाणसु मालिणित्ति ॥४४॥
[यस्याः पादे पङ्कजवदने दूरं श्रवणसुखावहे
सुललितबन्धे सन्नतबाहुके मुग्धे अन्तिमरत्ने ।
प्रथमद्वितीयौ तृतीयचतुर्थौ पञ्चमः षष्ठश्च सप्तमश्च
भवति पुरोहित इति बिम्बोष्ठि छन्दसि जानीहि मालिनीति ॥४४॥]

कद्रू 4 or 5+4+5.

कद्दूअ होई पाअए । बीआविरुद्धथणअए ।
मन्तिअओ सतुरंगओ । विरमे अ सत्तिदण्डओ ॥४५॥
[कद्रूा भवति पादे । द्वितीयाविरुद्धस्तने ।
मन्त्री सतुरंगो । विरामे च शक्तिदण्डः ॥४५॥]

ललिता 4 or 5+4+5+4+5+S

मन्तिअओ सतुरंगओ तइअरहङ्गअम्मि
सोच्चिअ होइ चउत्थओ पञ्चमबाणअम्मि ।
छ्ठो अ पउमराअओ मणहरबन्धअम्मि
जाणसु पङ्कअवअणिए ललिआपाअअम्मि ॥४६॥
[मन्त्री सतुरंगश्च तृतीयरथाङ्गे
स एव भवति चतुर्थः पञ्चमबाणे ।
षष्ठश्च पद्मरागो मनोहरबन्धे
जानीहि पङ्कजवदने ललितापादे ॥४६॥]
इय दुवईउ गणसमाउ संमत्ताउ । [इति द्विपद्यः गणसमाः समाप्ताः ।]

विपुला विषम IIS+ISS. सम 4+IIS+ISS.

विउलाइ पाआ । करसुरगयएहिं होन्ति ।
णवरं समा से । पमुहट्ठिअवारणिन्दा ॥४७॥
[विपुलायाः पादाः । करसुरगजाभ्यां भवन्ति ।
केवलं समा अस्याः । प्रमुखस्थितवारणेन्द्राः ॥४७॥]

धवला विषम 4+ISI+S. सम 4+5+IS.

रअणाअरे गओ । पत्थिवओ सहारओ ।
धवलाइ जुज्झए । रहकणआ धअग्गअम् ॥४८॥
[रत्नाकरे गजः । पार्थिवः सहारः ।
धवलायाः युद्धे । रथकनकौ ध्वजाग्रम् ॥४८॥]

सुमुखी विषम 4+4+S. सम 4+4+ISS.

रअणाअरअम्मि । रहतुरआ हारओ अ ।
समरे सुमुहीअ । जोहजुअं सुरगओ अ ॥४९॥
[रत्नाकरे । रथतुरगौ हारश्च ।
समरे सुमुख्याः । योधयुगं सुरगजश्च ॥४९॥]

सारसिका विषम IIS+IIS+IIS+S. सम SII+SII+SII+SS.

कुण हारविराम तिअं तो
सारसिआइ कराण समुद्दे ।
समरङ्गणअम्मि अ मुद्धे
पाअअ तिण्णि मणीण जुअं च ॥ ५० ॥
[कुरु हारविरामे त्रिकं तावत् । सारसिकायाः कराणां समुद्रे ।
समराङ्गणे च मुग्धे । पादास्त्रीन् मणीनां युगं च ॥५०॥]

भामिनी विषम IIS+IIS+IIS. सम SII+SII+SII+S.

कुण भामिणिआइ पिए । सारसिआइ कराण तिअम् ।
समरङ्गणअम्मिअ से । पायअ तिण्णि सणेउरआ ॥ ५१ ॥
[कुरु भामिन्याः प्रिये । सारसिकायाः कराणां त्रिकम् ।
समराङ्गणे चास्याः । पादांस्त्रींश्च सनूपुरान् ॥५१॥]

प्रसन्ना विषम SII+SII+SII+S. सम IIS+IIS+IIS+IIS.

पाअअ तिण्णि सणेउरआ । रअणायरअम्मि पसण्णिअए ।
संजुअअम्मि अ होइ पिए । करपल्लवआण चउक्कमिह ॥ ५२ ॥
[पादास्त्रयः सनूपुराः । रत्नाकरे प्रसन्नायाः ।
संयुगे च भवति प्रिये । करपल्लवानां चतुष्कमिह ॥५२॥]

नन्दा विषम 4+5+4. सम 4+4+ISI+IS.

जोहरहङ्गसन्दणआ । णन्दाइ हुवन्ति साअरए ।
तुरअगइन्दपत्थिवआ । तस्सं अ धओअ संजुअए ॥ ५३ ॥
[योधरथाङ्गस्यन्दनाः । नन्दायाः भवन्ति सागरे ।
तुरगगजेन्द्रपार्थिवाः । तस्याश्च ध्वजश्च संयुगे ॥५३॥]

श्वेता विषम 4+5+IS. सम 4+4+ISI+S.

सागरए गइन्दओ । सेआइ रहङ्गअं धओ ।
संजुअए तुरंगओ । जोहो अ सपत्थिवो मणी ॥ ५४ ॥
[सागरे गजेन्द्रः । श्वेतायाः रथाङ्गं ध्वजः ।
संयुगे तुरंगः । योधश्च सपार्थिवो मणिः ॥५४॥]

इअ दुवईऊ अद्धसमाऊ समत्ताऊ । इअ कइसिद्धवित्तजाईसमुच्चए तइऊ णिअमो सम्मत्तो । [इति द्विपद्यः अर्धसमाः समाप्ताः । इति कविसिद्धवृत्तजातिसमुच्चये तृतीयो नियमः समाप्तः ।]

IV

[For technical words, cf. I. 17·33 and Glossary.]

अठ्ठमअं सोलहमं च कुण मणीं गन्धअं चउद्दहमम् ।
छठ्ठं गाहाइ थणं दिअं च परिसेसजोहाई ॥ १ ॥
[अष्टमं षोडशं च कुरु मणिं; गन्धं चतुर्दशम् ।
पष्ठं गाथायाः स्तनं द्विजं च परिशेषयोधायाः ॥ १ ॥]

गाहापत्थारमहोवहिस्स तीसक्खरा समारम्भे ।
जाणह पञ्चावण्णक्खराइं तस्से अ विरमम्मि ॥ २ ॥
[गाथाप्रस्तारमहोदधेस्त्रिंशदक्षराणि समारम्भे ।
जानीहि पञ्चपञ्चाशदक्षराणि तस्य च विरामे ॥ २ ॥]

लक्ष्मी.

सत्तावीसा हारा जीसे दीसंति तिण्णि गन्धाइं ।
सा गाहाणं गाहा आई तीसक्खरा लच्छी ॥३॥
[सप्तविंशतिर्हारा यस्या दृश्यन्ते त्रीणि गन्धानि ।
सा गाथानां गाथा आदिस्त्रिंशदक्षरा लक्ष्मीः ॥३॥]

हंसवधू.

गयणअलविसअपसरिअमणहरससिकिरणणिअरहअतिमिरम् ।
अणुहवसु सुहअ बहुमअ सललिअअणरासिअरअरअणीम् ॥४॥
[गगनतलविषयप्रसृतमनोहरशशिकिरणनिकरहतातिमिराम् ।
अनुभव सुभग बहुमत सललितजनरसिक रतरजनीम् ॥४॥]

पत्थारसाअरवरं रयणे लुत्ते रसम्मि वड्ढन्ते ।
जाणह कमेण कन्ते छत्तीसं होन्ति गाहाओ ॥५॥
[प्रस्तारसागरवरे रत्ने लुप्ते रसे वर्धमाने ।
जानीहि क्रमेण कान्ते षट्त्रिंशद्भवन्ति गाथाः ॥५॥]
लच्छी सद्धी बुद्धी लज्जा विज्जा खमा अ दीहा अ ।
गोरी राई जोण्हा छाआ कन्ती महामई कित्ती ॥६॥
[लक्ष्मीः श्रद्धा बुद्धिर्लज्जा विद्या क्षमा च दीर्घा च ।
गौरी राजिर्ज्योत्स्ना छाया कान्तिर्महामतिः कीर्तिः ॥६॥]
मुद्धा मणोहरा रोहिणी विसाला सुहासिआ हरिणी ।
चक्कइआ सारसिआ कुररी हंसीअ हंसवहुअत्ति ॥ ७ ॥
[मुग्धा मनोहरा रोहिणी विशाला सुहासिका हरिणी ।
चक्रवाकी सारसिका कुररी हंसी च हंसवधूरिति ॥ ७ ॥]
कण्णकरचलणविप्पांसएहिं पढमट्ठिएहिं जाण इह ।
जहसंखं सव्वाणं जाईणं वण्णपरिवाडिम् ॥ ८ ॥
[कर्णकरचरणविप्रांशैः प्रथमस्थितैर्जानीहि इह ।
यथासंख्यं सर्वासां जातीनां वर्णपरिपाटिम् ॥ ८ ॥]

स्कन्धक (S. N.)

पञ्चण्ह सया पुरओ दुण्हअ मग्गेण वारणाण णियमिअओ । (मिओ ?)
जह दइए पुव्वद्धे तह पच्छद्धेवि खंधअस्स णरिंदो ॥ ९ ॥
[पञ्चानां सदा पुरतो द्वयोश्चाग्रे वारणयोर्नियमितः ।
यथा दयिते पूर्वार्धे तथा पश्चार्धेपि स्कन्धकस्य नरेन्द्रः ॥ ९ ॥]
छव्वीसं जह गाहा रअणे लुत्ते रसम्मि वड्ढंते ।
एक्कोणत्तीसं खन्धअस्स णामाइं तह अ पिए ॥ १० ॥
[षड्विंशतिर्यथा गाथा रत्ने लुप्ते रसे वर्धमाने ।
एकोनत्रिंशत् स्कन्धकस्य नामानि तथा च प्रिये ॥ १० ॥]
पवण-रवि-धणअ-हुअवह-सुरणाह-समुद्द-वरुण-ससि-सेला ।
महु-माहव-मअण-जअन्त-भमर-सुअ-सारस-मज्जारा ॥ (?) ११ ॥
हरि-हरिण-हत्थि-काआ कुम्मो णअ-विणअ-विक्कमोच्छाहा ।
धम्मत्थकामसहिआ णत्तीसअ खन्धआ होन्ति ॥ १२ ॥
[पवन-रवि-धनद-हुतवह-सुरनाथ-समुद्र-वरुण-शशि-शैलाः ।
मधु-माधव-मदन-जयन्त-भ्रमर-शुक-सारस-मार्जाराः ॥ ११ ॥]
[हरि-हरिण-हस्ति-काकाः कूर्मो नय-विनय-विक्रमोत्साहाः ।
धर्मार्थकामसहिता एकोनत्रिंशत् स्कन्धका भवन्ति ॥ १२ ॥]

गीति (S. N.)

गाहापुव्वद्धं विअ जीअ सुअणु पुव्वपच्छिमद्धाइं ।
सा पिङ्गलेण गीइत्ति दाविआ सव्वछन्दवित्ताणम् ॥ १३ ॥
[गाथापूर्वार्धमिव यस्याः सुतनु पूर्वपश्चिमार्धानि ।
सा पिङ्गलेन गीतिरिति दर्शिता सर्वछन्दोविदाम् ॥ १३ ॥]

उपगीति (S. N.)

गाहापच्छद्धं विय पुव्वद्धं पच्छिमद्धं च ।
जीसे सा उवगीई तेणं चिअ लक्खणे भणिआ ॥ १४ ॥
[गाथापश्चार्धमिव पूर्वार्धं पश्चिमार्धं च ।
यस्याः सा उपगीतिस्तेनैव लक्षणे भणिता ॥ १४ ॥]

विलासिनी 5+5 (Both these must be अन्त्यगुरु) +ISI+S

मणिविरामबाणाण मज्झओ
घित्तुआण दो दे शिलीमुहे ।
पत्थिवं च तइअं विलासिणी-
पाअअम्मि फुडणेउरिल्लिए ॥१५॥
[मणिविरामबाणानां मध्यतो गृहीत्वा द्वौ देहि शिलीमुखौ ।
पार्थिवं च तृतीयं विलासिनी-पादे स्फुटनूपुरे ॥१५॥]

निर्वापिता 4+4+ISI or III +5.

पढमाबीआ हुअन्ति जोहआ
तइभणिरूविअणरिन्दविप्पआ
चउगणघडिआ विरामबाणआ
होन्ति अ णिव्वाइआइ पाअआ ॥१६॥
[प्रथमद्वितीयौ भवतो योधौ तृतीयनिरूपितनरेन्द्रविप्रा : ।
चतुर्गणघटिता विरामबाणा भवन्ति च निर्वापितायाः पादाः ॥१६॥]

बाणासिका 4+4+ISI or IIII+IIS or SS.

सतुरंगरहस्स देसु पुरओ
णिअमेण थणं व विप्पअं वा ।
विरमे च करं व कण्णअं वा
सुन्दरि बाणासिआइ पाए ॥१७॥
[सतुरंगरथस्य देहि पुरतो नियमेन स्तनं वा विप्रं वा ।
विरामे च करं वा कर्णं वा सुन्दरि बाणासिकायाः पादे ॥१७॥]

खञ्जक विषम 4+SIS. सम 4+II+SIS.

तुरअसुअण्णआ । उवहिं विथिइण्णआ ।
सुन्दरि खञ्जए । समरे रसमज्झआ ॥१८॥

[तुरगसुपर्णौं । उदधौ वितीर्णौं ।
सुन्दरि खञ्जके । समरे रसमध्यौ ॥ १८ ॥]

परिनन्दित SIS+II+ISI+ISS.

देसु चामरसरूवसहारे
दिठ्ठिअं सरसअम्मि नरिन्दे ।
मग्गओ सुरगअस्स णिउत्ते
पाअअम्मि परिणन्दिअअस्स ॥ १९ ॥

[देहि चामरसरूपसहारे । दृष्टिं सरसे नरेन्द्रे ॥
मार्गतः सुरगजस्य नियुक्ते । पादे परिनन्दितकस्य ॥ १९ ॥]

आनन्दित 4+4 [ISI allowed]+4+IS.

बीआविरुद्धयणहारए
आणन्दिअस्स कुण पाअए ।
जोहं सरहं सतुरंगअं
विरमे अ वरोरु धअग्गअम् ॥ २० ॥

[द्वितीयाविरुद्धस्तनहारे । आनन्दितस्य कुरु पादे ॥
योधं सरथं सतुरङ्गं । विरामे च वरोरु ध्वजाग्रम् ॥ २० ॥]

क्रीडनक 4+4+4+SIS or IIIS+IS.

सतुरंगमए सवारणे सजोहए
विहवाहिवइं व विसहरं व मुद्धिए ।
ठविअम्मि ठवे अन्तिमधअवडाअए
महुरक्खरए कीलणअस्स पाअए ॥ २१ ॥

[सतुरंगमे सवारणे सयोधे । विहगाधिपतिं वा विषधरं वा मुग्धिके ।
स्थापिते स्थापय अंतिमध्वजपताके । मधुराक्षरे क्रीडनकस्य पादे ॥२१॥]

तरङ्गक SII+SII+SII+SII+SS.

हाररसाण तिअम्मि णआङ्गि विइण्णे
देसु सणेउररूवजुअं पुरइल्लम् ।
चामरअं कडअं च वरोरु विरामे
दूरसमुज्जलअम्मि तरङ्गअपाए ॥ २२ ॥

[हाररसयोस्त्रिके नताङ्गि वितीर्णे । देहि सनूपुररूपयुगं पौरस्त्यम् ।
चामरं कटकं च वरोरु विरामे । दूरसमुज्ज्वले तरङ्गकपादे ॥ २२ ॥]

साम्या (S. N.)

भवति मुद्गरो हारयोधश्च तस्याग्रतो मौक्तिकं प्रिये ।
जातु साम्यायाश्चतुर्थभागे मात्राधिकं विद्धि पार्थिवे ॥ २३ ॥

अधिकाक्षरा 4+4+(ISI or IIII)+4+4+5.

विसमठ्ठाणाविरुद्धथणतइअदिअणरिन्दआ
णिद्दिठ्ठा कइवरेहिं रवितेरहवीसामआ ।
ठवेसु अहिअक्खराइ छठ्ठणिरूविअबाणआ
अंसावि हु सेसआ गअतुरअएहिं णिबद्धआ ॥ २४ ॥

[विषमस्थानाविरुद्धस्तन-तृतीयद्विजनरेन्द्राः
निर्दिष्टाः कविवरैः रवि-त्रयोदशविश्रामाः ।
स्थापयाधिकाक्षरायाः षष्ठनिरूपितबाणाः
अंशा अपि खलु शेषाः गजतुरगैर्निबद्धाः ॥ २४ ॥]

नर्कुटक (S. N.) 4+5+5 (either ISS, SIS, or IIIS)+4+SS.

पढमचउत्थजोहरहपञ्चमकण्णाए
बीअतईअहोइसुरहत्थिसुअण्णाए ।
कूला दीहवण्णएआरविलुत्ताए
जस्स विसग्गु होइ णक्कोडअपाआए ॥ २५ ॥

[प्रथमचतुर्थयोर्धरथपञ्चमकर्णः । द्वितीयतृतीयभोगिसुरहस्तिसुपर्णः ॥
कूला दीर्घवर्णैकारविलुप्तः । यस्य विसर्गो भवति नर्कुटकपादः ॥२५॥]

रमणीयक 5+5+4+4+IS.

जण्णिउत्तसरतोमरजोहतुरंगअं
विरमअम्मि दूरूज्जलवण्णधअग्गअम् ।
तं विआण सुपरिठ्ठिअजइरमणिज्जअं
छन्दअम्मि छअओअरिए रमणिज्जअम् ॥ २६ ॥

[यन्नियुक्तशरतोमरयोधतुरंगं । विरामे दूरोज्वलवर्णध्वजाग्रम् ।
तं विजानीहि सुपरिष्ठितयतिरमणीयं । छन्दसि शातोदरि रमणीयकम् ॥२६॥]

द्विपथक (S.N.) 4+4+4+S+4+4+SS.

तिण्णितुरंगा णेउरओ । विप्पाइक्का कण्णु ।
दुवहअपच्छद्धेवि तह । वद लक्खणउ ण अण्णु ॥२७॥
[त्रयस्तुरंगा नूपुरः । द्वौ पदाती कर्णः ।
द्विपथपश्चार्धेपि (तथा) । वद लक्षणं नान्यत् ॥ २७ ॥]

मागधिका 2+2+2+SIS+IS,

वेआलिअअं रसौं लसौ
जइ आभाससि चारुणेत्तिए ।
तो मागहिअत्ति लक्खणे
णिम्माअंति मुणेसु सुन्दरि ॥ २८ ॥

[वैतालीयं रसौ लघो
यदि आभाग्रसे चारुनेत्रि ।
ततो मागधिकामिति लक्षणे
निर्मितामिति जानीहि सुन्दरि ॥ २८ ॥]

मात्रा (S. N.)

विसमछन्द पाअमत्ताहु । वेतिण्णिअ सुम्मसुहि ।
मणिरूवरसगणविणिम्मिया ।
ताहु पाअहु माज्झिमहु । णिउणएहिं लक्खणु णिरूविउ ॥२९॥
[विषमच्छन्दसः पादा मात्राणां । द्वौत्रयश्च सौम्यमुखि । मणिरूपसगण-
विनिर्मिताः । तेषां पादानां मध्यमानां । निपुणैः लक्षणं निरूपितम्॥२९॥]

करहि तेरह भोदि मत्ताइ । स चउद्दह मोअणिअ ।
पणरहहिं चारुणेत्तिअ ।
जा सोलह अन्तिमिअ । तहु णाम राहुस्सेणिआ ॥ ३० ॥
[करही त्रयोदशभिर्भवति मात्राभिः । स चतुर्दश मोदनिकायाः ।
पञ्चदशभिश्चारुनेत्र्याः । यस्यां षोडश अतिमायां । तस्या नाम राहुसेनिका
॥ ३० ॥]

रड्ड (S. N.)

एअहु मत्तहु अन्तिमउ । जव्विहि दुवहउ भोदि ।
तो तहु णामें रड्ड फुडु । छन्दइ कइअणु भ्रोदि ॥ ३१ ॥
[एतासां मात्राणां अन्तिमो । यदा द्विपथो भवति ।
तदा तं नाम्ना रड्डं स्फुटं । छन्दसि कविजनो ब्रूते ॥ ३१ ॥]

अडिला (S. N.)

सुइसुहाइं विणिएप्पिउणु (?) इह पत्थारसाअरे
सुअणु विविहवित्ताइ सुसंचिअगुणमणोहरे ।
अडिला होइ आहीरिआइ णअङ्गि भासाई
सजमएहिं पाएहिं समद्धसमेहिं कुण सआ ॥ ३२ ॥
[श्रुतिसुखानि पर्यालोच्य इह प्रस्तारसागरे
सुतनु विविधवृत्तानि सुसंचितगुणमनोहरे ।
अडिला भवति आभीर्या नताङ्गि भाषया
सयमकैः पादैः समार्धसमैः कुरु सदा ॥ ३२ ॥]

अडिलालक्खणं अणिदिट्ठरूवेण ।
संदणअं रहंग संजाणह । विन्धउ हारुएहि संजाणह ।
जमअविसुद्धएहिं संजाणह । अडिलालक्खणम्मि संजाणह ॥ ३३ ॥

[स्यन्दनो रथाङ्गं संजानीत । हार संजानीत ।
यमकविशुद्धैः संजानीत । अडिलालक्षणे संजानीत ॥ ३३ ॥]

धोरणि गुमगुमेइ भमराहुं सरन्तीअ
पङ्कअसंकुलेहिं सलिलेहिं सरन्तीअ ।
भमरभरोणएहिं कुसुमेहि सरन्तरू
विअसइ ताण मीसुव वंसहु सरन्तरू ॥ ३४ ॥

ढोसा (S. N.)

जइ ब्राह्मणि तिण्हु चउत्थु देहि हू कुञ्जराहु सामन्तु ।
भासा तो ब्रोहिअ मारवाइऊ गाह ढोसत्ति ॥ ३५ ॥
अह तिहु चउत्थ ण ब्रोदि कहवि सो कुञ्जराहु सामन्तु ।
तो देहि चउत्थउ माहणोवि ढोसाहु ण्हउ दोसु ॥ ३६ ॥
[यदि ब्राम्हणि त्रयाणां ददासि खलु कुञ्जराणां सामन्तम् ।
भाषया ततो ब्रूहि मारव्या गाथां ढोसामिति ॥ ३६ ॥
अथ त्रयाणां चतुर्थो न भवति कथमप्यसौ कुञ्जराणां सामन्तः ।
ततो देहि चतुर्थं ब्राह्मणमपि ढोसायां नैव दोषः ॥ ३६ ॥]

गाहाजुअलएण ढासाहि णाम । [गाथायुगलेन ढोसाया नाम ।]

रासक I (defined by a वस्तुक = 4+4+4+4).

वित्थारिअआणुमएण कुण । दुवईछन्दोणुमएव्व पुण ।
इअ रासअ सुअणु मणोहरए । वेआरिअसंमत्तक्खरए ॥ ३७ ॥
[विस्तारितकानुमतेन कुरु । द्विपदीच्छन्दोनुमते वा पुनः ।
एतत् रासकं सुतनु मनोहरम् । विदारीसमामाक्षरम् ॥ ३७ ॥]

रासक II.

अडिलाहिं दुवहएहिंव मत्तारठ्ठाहिं तह अ ढोसाहिं ।
बहुएहिं जो रइज्जई सो भण्णइ रासऊ णाम ॥ ३८ ॥
[अडिलाभिर्द्विपथकैर्वा मात्रारथ्याभिस्तथा च ढोसाभिः ।
बहुभिर्यो रच्यते स भण्यते रासको नाम ॥ ३८ ॥]

मालाशीर्षक.

चलणसमोहसिअरत्तपङ्कअ, पसत्थथोरोरु
लडहतणुमज्झ, तुङ्गपीवरपऊहरिल्लिए ।
करअललाअण्णणिज्जिआसोअमुद्धपल्लव
विउद्धकन्दोद्ध (?) णअण, कोमुइमियङ्कवअणिए ॥
ठवेसु तइअअणिउत्तथणविप्प-सेसमाअङ्ग-
तुरअपाइक्कजोहरहए समाणसंखए ।

विसमठ्ठाणअविरुद्धणरणाह-विअडपअमग्ग-
घडिअसुइसुहवण्ण-दीहअरसमासजुत्तए ॥ ३९ ॥
विरमणिरूविअबाणए अवलंबिअगीइअत्थसेसेसु ।
चउसुवि सण्णवाहिए इह मालासीसअस्स पाएसु ॥ ४० ॥
[चरणसमुपहसितरक्तपङ्कजे, प्रशस्तस्थिरोरु,
लटभतनुमध्ये, तुङ्गपीवरपयोधरे ।
करतललावण्यनिर्जिताशोकमुग्धपल्लवे,
विबुद्धनयने, कौमुदीमृगाङ्कवदने ।
स्थापय तृतीयनियुक्तस्तनविप्र-शेषमातङ्ग-
तुरगपदातियोधरथान् समानसंख्यान् ।
विषमस्थानाविरुद्धनरनाथ-विकटपदमार्ग-
घटितश्रुतिसुखवर्णदीर्घतरसमासयुक्तान् ॥ ३९ ॥
विरामनिरूपितबाणान् अवलम्बितगीतिकार्थशेषेषु ।
चतुर्ष्वपि सन्नतबाहिके इह मालाशीर्षकस्य पादेषु ॥ ४० ॥]
मालासीसअस्स लक्खणत्थे गीइआ । [मालाशीर्षकस्य लक्षणार्थे गीतिका ।]

अधिकाक्षरशीर्षक (S. N.)

कइणो चिन्तन्तअस्स अहिअक्खरत्थसेसअं
णीलुप्पलविअसिअच्छि जइ गीइआ-समत्तअम् ।
तो जाणसु सण्णअङ्गि दूरमहुरक्खरिल्लअं
सत्थत्थविअक्खणाण पुरिसाण सुइसुहावहम् ॥ ४१ ॥
माणिणि दाविज्जतुअं तुह दंसणसुहरसाविअण्हेण ।
विरहण्हएण मुद्धिए अहिअक्खरसीसअंति बीअंपि ॥ ४२ ॥
[कवेश्चिन्तयतः अधिकाक्षरार्थशेषं
नीलोत्पलविकसिताक्षि यदि गीतिकासमाप्तम् ।
ततो जानीहि सन्नताङ्गि दूरमधुराक्षरं
शास्त्रार्थविचक्षणानां पुरुषाणां श्रुतिसुखावहम् ॥ ४१ ॥
मानिनि दर्श्यमानं तव दर्शनसुखरसावितृष्णेन ।
विरहाह्नेण मुग्धिके अधिकाक्षरशीर्षकमिति द्वितीयमपि ॥ ४२ ॥]

त्रिकलक (S. N.)

अहिअक्खरसीसअस्स अवलम्बिअत्थपआढिआ
विणिउज्जइ सण्णअङ्गि मज्झे जइ णिव्वाइया ।
तो जाणसु तिअलअंति वहुछन्दउत्तमणिअं
बीअं वि पुणो मुणेसु छउऊअरि सीसअं तम् ॥ ४३ ॥

अहिअक्खरसीसअस्स जं मए
तुह कहिअं लक्खणं पिअल्लिए ।
भणिअं तं वा इमम्मि तिअलए
ससहरवयणे कवीहिं छन्दए ॥ ४४ ॥
[अधिकाक्षरशीर्षकस्यावलम्बितार्थप्रकटिता
विनियुज्यते संनताङ्गि मध्ये यदि निर्वापिता ।
ततो जानीहि त्रिकलकमिति वहुछन्दोविद्भणितं ।
द्वितीयमपि पुनो जानीहि शातोदरि शीर्षकं तम् ॥ ४३ ॥
अधिकारशीर्षकस्य यन्मया । तव कथितं लक्षणं प्रियतमे ।
भणितं तदेव अस्मिन् त्रिकलके । शशधरवदने कवीभिश्छन्दसि ॥४४॥]
मालासीसभणामे इच्छासमसंखअंसणिअमेण ।
जं लक्खणं पिअल्लिए कहिअं तं वा इमम्मि तिअलअए ॥ ४५ ॥
[मालाशीर्षकनाम्नि इच्छासमसंख्यांशनियमेन ।
यल्लक्षणं प्रियतमे कथितं तदेवास्मिन् त्रिकलके ॥ ४५ ॥]

दण्डक (S. N.)

सललिअगमणे पिए पुण्णअन्दाणणे दीहराअङ्गपल्ह-
त्थणीलुप्पले णाअसत्थत्थसंभाविए ।
कणअकलससंणिहोत्तुङ्गपीणत्थणोक्कम्पवोसद्धलाभण्ण-
सोहासुसोहाविआणेअसिद्धङ्गणे ॥
रसरवफरिसेसु दिण्णेसु दे दुण्णि गन्धे पुणो पाअडं
पक्खिणाइं समाणाइ संखाइ बिम्बोट्ठिए ।
चउसुवि इह दण्डए चारुपाएसु इच्छाइ दूरुज्जणे
वलन्तेसु (?) थोरोरुसोहासुसोहाविए ॥ ४६ ॥
[सललितगमने प्रिये पूर्णचन्द्रानने
दीर्घापाङ्गपर्यस्तनीलोत्पले ज्ञातशास्त्रार्थसंभाविते ।
कनककलशसंनिभोतुङ्गपीनस्तनोत्कम्पविक-
सितलावण्यशोभासुशोभितानेकासिद्धाङ्गने ।
रस × × स्पर्शेषु दत्तेषु देहि द्वौ गन्धौ पुनः
प्रकटं पांक्षनायं समानया संख्यया विम्बोष्ठि ।
चतुर्ष्वपि इह दण्डके चारुपादेपु इच्छया
स्थविरोरुशोभासुशोभिते ॥४६॥]

खण्डोद्गता (S. N.)

करमत्तआ कण्णअमत्तअव्व खण्डुग्गआइ विसमा
हुवन्ति सव्वे (वि) दीहधवलच्छि विरमङ्गाणुजलदिण्णतिमत्तआ ।

अणरिन्दआ विसमट्ठाणएसु पाआ समावि
कअबीअतईअसरसेससणिअमसजमअसमसंखतुरअगआ
सणरिन्दआ ॥ ४७ ॥]
[करमात्राः कर्णमात्रा वा खण्डोद्गताया विषमा •
भवन्ति सर्वेपि दीर्घधवलाक्षि विरामस्थानोज्ज्वलदत्तत्रिमात्राः ।
अनरेन्द्रा विषमस्थानेषु पादाः समा अपि
कृतद्वितीयतृतीयशरशेषसानियमसयमकसमसंख्यतुरगगजाः
सनरेन्द्राः ॥ ४७ ॥]

वैतालीयं विषम 6+SIS+IS. सम 8+SIS+IS
वइआलिअअं दुमत्तआ
तिण्णि विहङ्गवई धअग्गअम् ।
समपाअमुहेसु वड्ढिआ
होइ रसेण व णेउरेण वा ॥ ४८ ॥
[वैतालीयं द्विमात्राः । त्रयो विहङ्गपतिर्ध्वजाग्रम् ।
समपादमुखेषु वर्धिता । भवति रसेन वा नूपुरेण वा ॥ ४८ ॥]

औपच्छंदासिक विषम 6+SIS+ISS. सम 8+SIS+ISS.
वइआलिअअस्स पाअअम्मि
एक्को वड्ढइ चारुभूसणेणम् ।
तं साहइ तुज्झ दीहरच्छि
उअछन्दसए लक्खणं विरामे ॥ ४९ ॥
[वैतालीयस्य पादे । एकं वर्धते चारुभूषणम् ।
तत् कथ्यते तव दीर्घाक्षि । औपच्छन्दसिके लक्षणं विरामे ॥ ४९ ॥]

आचालित विषम 6+SII+SS. सम 8+SII+SS
आचाअलिअम्मि दुमत्ता
तिण्णि पुणो चलणा मणिहारा ।
समपाअमुहेसु णिजुत्ता
तस्स मणिव्व रसोव्व इसीहिं ॥ ५० ॥
[आचालिते द्विमात्राः
त्रयः पुनश्चरणो मणिहारौ ।
समपादमुखेषु नियुक्तः
तस्य मणिर्वा रसो वा ऋषिभिः ॥ ५० ॥]
वइआलिअ-उअछन्दस-आचालिअआण मा कुण समेसु ।
पाएसु तिण्णि घडणट्ठिए रसे दीहधवलच्छि ॥ ५१ ॥

[वैतालीयौपच्छन्दसिकाचालितानां मा कुरु समेषु ।
पादेषु त्रीन् घटनास्थितान्रसान् दीर्घधवलाक्षि ॥५१॥]
[गाहा वेआलिअ-उवछंदसआचायलियाण समपाअविशेसलक्खणत्थे ॥]

उद्गता 4+5+5+any number of 4.

पढमणिउत्तहत्थिबीआसितइज्जरहङ्गसुरगएहिं
समसंखाइ सेसपाइक्कजोहसन्दणगअन्दएहिं ।
कीरइ उग्गआइ सव्वाअरेण विरमठ्ठिअजमएहिं
समणिलआविरुद्धवसुहाहिवेहिं चउहिंवि पाअएहिं ॥ ५२ ॥
[प्रथमनियुक्तहस्तिद्वितीयासितृतीयरथाङ्गसुरगजैः
समसंख्यया शेषपदातियोधस्यन्दनगजेन्द्रैः ।
क्रियते उद्गता च सर्वादरेण विरमस्थितयमकैः
समनिलयाविरुद्धवसुधाधिपैश्चतुर्भिरपि पादैः ॥ ५२ ॥]

कोट्टुम्भक SII or SS+SIS+5+IIS+IIS+ISI+S.

दे कुट्टुम्भअस्स पढमं चलणं अहवा अ कण्णअं
भामिणि बीअअं च विहआहिवइं तइअं रहङ्गअम् ।
पाणिजुअं पुणोवि सपऊहरअं महुरक्खरिल्लिए
कोमलबन्धअम्मि विरमुज्जलए रअणं च पाअए ॥ ५३ ॥
[देहि कोट्टुम्भकस्य प्रथमं चरणं अथवा च कर्णं
भामिनि द्वितीयं च विहगाधिपतिं तृतीयं रथाङ्गम् ।
पाणियुगं पुनरपि सपयोधरं मधुराक्षरवति ।
कोमलबन्धे विरामोज्ज्वले रत्नं च पादे ॥ ५३ ॥]

छित्तक IIS+IIS+IIS+IIS.

रसणेउरभावमणीण पिए
पुरऊ करपल्लवआण जुअम् ।
कसणोप्पलसंणिहलोअणिए
कुण छित्तअपाअमणोहरए ॥ ५४ ॥
[रसनूपुरभावमणीनां प्रिये । पुरतः करपल्लवानां युगम् ।
कृष्णोत्पलसंनिभलोचने । कुरु छित्तकपादमनोहरे ॥ ५४ ॥]

भित्तक S+II+S+II+SII+SS.

चामरभावजुअम्मि विइण्णे
देसु सणेउररूवजुअं च ।
हारलअं कडअं च विरामे
दूरसमुज्जलभित्तिअपाए ॥ ५५ ॥

[चामरभावयुगे वितीर्णे । देहि सनूपुररूपयुगं च ।
हारलतां कटकं च विरामे । दूरसमुज्ज्वलभित्तकपादे ॥ ५५ ॥]

सामुद्गका 4+5+5+4+4+4+SS.

विरमट्ठाणएसु पसअच्छि कण्णएहिँ विइण्णएहिँ
समणिलआविरुद्धणिअमिअमणोहरेहिं पऊहरेहिं ।
तइअट्ठाणबीअनिलए सरासणेहिं (कआसणेहिं)
अइ सामुग्गआइ सेसे पिए गएहिँ विलग्गएहिं ॥ ५६ ॥
[विरामस्थानेषु प्रसृताक्षि कर्णैर्वितीर्णैः
समनिलयाविरुद्धनियमितमनोहरैः पयोधरैः ।
तृतीयस्थाने द्वितीयनिलये च शरासनैः (कृतासनैः)
अयि सामुद्गकायाः शेषे प्रिये गजैर्विलग्नैः ॥ ५६ ॥]

गाय SIS+IIS+SS.

पक्खिणाहअहत्थाणं । अन्तअम्मि दुहारा (अ) ।
दे इमस्स सआ पाए । हंसगामिणि गाइस्स ॥ ५७ ॥
[पक्षिनाथहस्तयोः । अन्ते द्वौ हारौ च ।
देहि एतस्य सदा पादे । हंसगामिनि गायस्य ॥ ५७ ॥]

नाराचक IS+IS+IS+IS.

णाराअस्स विरुज्झइ णअङ्गि णिअअम्मि लक्खणे णामम् ।
जेण सआ तेण मए णिअरसणं केवलं भणिअम् ॥ ५८ ॥
[नाराचकस्य विरुध्यते नताङ्गि निजे लक्षणे नाम ।
येन सदा तेन मया निदर्शनं केवलं भणितम् ॥ ५८ ॥]
ससद्दणेउरं धअं । सरूवकुण्डलं रवम् ।
ठवेसु तस्स पाअए । विरामए सहाअरअम् ॥ ५९ ॥
[सशब्दनूपुरं ध्वजं । सरूपकुण्डलं रवम् ।
स्थापय तस्य पादे । विरामे सहारम् ॥ ५९ ॥]

ललिता 4+4+4+4+4+S.

गअरहतुरंगसन्दणणिउत्तजोहेहिँ
रणअविरुद्धणराहिवविलग्गसोहेहिं ।
छट्ठणिरूविअमरगअविरामजमएहिँ
ललिअं ठवेसु सुन्दरिए समपाएहिँ ॥ ६० ॥
[गजरथतुरङ्गस्यन्दननियुक्तयोधैः । रणाविरुद्धनराधिपविलग्नशोभैः ।
षष्ठनिरूपितमरकत-विरामयमकैः । ललितां स्थापय सुन्दरि समपादैः ॥ ६० ॥]

भ्रमरावलि IIS+ISS+IIS+IIS+IIS.

रसणेउर-भावमणीण जुअस्स जुअं
णिअमेण णिउञ्जसु रूअजुअं समणिम् ।
भमरावलिआइ सुदूरमणोहरए
ललिअक्खरपंतिपसाहणसोहिअए ॥ ६१ ॥
[रसनूपुरभावमणीनां युगस्य युगं
नियमेन नियुङ्क्ष्व रूपयुगं समणिम् ।
भ्रमरावल्याः सुदूरमनोहरे
ललिताक्षरपङ्क्तिप्रसाधनशोभिते ॥ ६१ ॥]

कुमुदक 4+5+5+SII+S.

तुरगरहङ्गबाणए चलणं च सआ
ताण पुरिअअं कुण णेउरं छउए ।
सहिअअमणसुहावए महुरक्खरए
कुमुअअपाअए मुद्धिए सोहणए ॥ ६२ ॥
[तुरगरथाङ्गबाणान् चरणं च सदा
तेषां पुरस्तात्कुरु नूपुरं शाते ।
सहृदयमनःसुखावहे मधुराक्षरे
कुमुदकपादे मुग्धिके शोभने ॥ ६२ ॥]

उत्फुल्लक 4+4+4+4+4+SS.

तिण्णि रहाइं ठवेप्पिणु बे गअ णिहणइं कण्णू ।
ए उफ्फुल्लअलक्खणु पच्छद्धे वि ण अण्णू ॥ ६३ ॥
[त्रीन् रथान् स्थापयित्वा द्वौ गजौ निधने कर्णम् ।
एतदुत्फुल्लकलक्षणं पश्चार्धेपि नान्यत् ॥ ६३ ॥]

संगतक SII+SII+SS+SII+SII+S with a गाथा at the end.

चामरभावजुअं हाराण जुअं च पिए
दीसइ मुत्तिअअं रूवाण जुअं च सआ ।
हारविहूसिअअं सद्दाण जुअं छउए
अन्ति णिऊइअअं पाए जइ णेउरअम् ॥ ६४ ॥
गाहा तहअ विरामे दीसइ पसअच्छि तो विआणेज्ज ।
संगअअं णाम इमं मत्तावित्ताण मज्झम्मि ॥ ६५ ॥
[चामरभावयुगं हारयोर्युगं च प्रिये । दृश्यते मौक्तिकं रूपयोर्युगं च सदा ।
हारविभूषितं शब्दयोर्युगं शाते । अन्ते नियोजितं पादे यदि नूपुरम् ॥ ६४ ॥
गाथा तथा च विरामे दृश्यते प्रसृताक्षि ततो विज्ञेयम् ।
संगतकं नामैतत् मात्रावृत्ताणां मध्ये ॥ ६५ ॥]

मत्तागणवण्णसमं असक्कीरी ? । गाहा अणन्तरवत्थुअसहिआ ॥

बिन्दुतिलक (विषम) 4+4+4+S. (सम) 4+4+5+IS.

विसमम्मि पिए तिण्णि गआ
चामरअं च विरामए ठिअं ।
दो तुरआ बाणं च समे
बिन्दुतिलए धअं च पाअए ॥ ६६ ॥
[विषमे प्रिये त्रयो गजाः । चामरं च विरामे स्थितम् ।
द्वौ तुरगौ बाणश्च समे । बिन्दुतिलके ध्वजश्च पादे ॥ ६६ ॥]

वीथी 4+4+4+SIS+S.

पठमं दइए होई तुरंग अस्स
बीअं च गअं तइअं सन्दणं च ।
विहआहिवई चामरअं च पाए
वीथित्ति इमं जाणसु छन्दअम्मि ॥ ६७ ॥
[प्रथमं दयिते भवति तुरङ्गोऽस्य । द्वितीयश्च गजस्तृतीयः स्यन्दनश्च ।
विहगाधिपतिश्चामरं च पादे । वीथीति एतज्जानीहि छन्दसि ॥ ६७ ॥]

अवलम्बक 4+SIS.

दीसइ पाअए । जत्थ गअन्दअम् ।
अन्तसुवण्णअं । तं ओलम्बअम् ॥ ६८ ॥
[दृश्यते पादे । यत्र गजेन्द्रः ॥ अन्तसुपर्णः । तदवलम्बकम् ॥ ६८ ॥]

चतुष्पद (S. N.)

पक्खिणाहा दुवे कण्ण । पडहरसरवकरम् ।
चावविहआहिवं । दोसु अ चउप्पए ॥ ६९ ॥
[पक्षिनाथौ द्वौ, कर्णः । पटह-रस-रव-करम् ।
चापविहगाधिपौ । द्वयोश्च चतुष्पदे ॥ ६९ ॥]

एक्कका

ओलम्बअ-एक्कअ-जोइआ जुआ सा चउप्पआ छन्दे
साहेमि एक्कअं णामवज्जिअं लक्खणं णाम ॥ ७० ॥
[अवलम्बित-एक्कक-योजिता युता सा चतुष्पदी छन्दसि ।
कथयामि एक्ककां नामवर्जितं लक्षणं नाम ॥ ७० ॥]

गाहा बीअचउप्पआत्थे आणंतुधयं (?) ।

तिलक 4+5+ISI+SS.

जस्स रहं रहङ्गअं च पाए । दीसइ मुद्धिए णरिन्दअं च ।
अन्ते कण्णअं च सोहणं से । तं तिलअंति जाण छन्दअम्मि ॥ ७१ ॥

[यस्य रथो रथाङ्गं च पादे । दृश्येते मुग्धे नरेन्द्रश्च ।
अन्ते कर्णश्च शोभनोऽस्य । तत्तिलकमिति जानीहि छन्दसि ॥७१॥]

हंसिनी SIS+I+SS+I+S.

पक्खिणाहअं दाविअं । सद्दअं च कण्णो रवम् ॥
णेउरं च पाअन्तए । हंसिणीअ पाए पिए ॥ ७२ ॥
[पक्षिनाथो दर्शित : । शब्दश्च कर्णो; रव : ।
नूपुरं च पादान्ते । हंसिन्याः पादे प्रिये ॥ ७२ ॥]

खडहडक is made up of भ्रमरावलि and a गाथा.

भमरावलिआअन्ते गाहा जइ दिज्जए पऊएसु ।
तं जाणह खडहडअं पुव्वकईहिं विणिद्दिठ्ठम् ॥ ७३ ॥
[भ्रमरावल्या अन्ते गाथा यदि दीयते प्रयोगेषु ।
तज्जानीत खडहडकं पूर्वकवीभिर्विनिर्दिष्टम् ॥ ७३ ॥]
जइ पीणसमुण्णअसंगअआ थणआ
जइ मन्थरलोअणभूसिअअं वअणम् ।
जइ वित्थइपीणविसंठुलओ जहणो
जइ तम्बिरपल्लवकोमलओ अहरो ॥ ७४ ॥
ता कीस हिअअ रत्तिंदिअं च नो णिव्वुइं तुअं लहसि ।
दुल्लहमग्गिर विणिअत्त अहव सन्तो णिअत्तिहिसि ॥ ७५ ॥
[यदि पीनसमुन्नतसंगतौ स्तनौ। यदि मन्थरलोचनभूषितं वदनम् ।
यदि विस्तृतपीनाविसंष्ठुलो जघन: । यदि ताम्रपल्लवकोमलोऽधर : ॥७४॥
तत्किं हृदय रात्रिं दिवं च नो निर्वृतिं त्वं लभसे ।
दुर्लभमार्गाद्विनिवर्तस्व अथवा सान्तो निवर्तयिष्यसि ॥ ७५ ॥]

खेटक SIS+ISI+S.

पक्खिणाहअं पिए । पत्थिवं च बीअअम् ॥
णेउरं च अन्तए । खेडअस्स पाअए ॥ ७६ ॥
[पक्षिनाथः प्रिये । पार्थिवश्च द्वितीयः ॥
नूपुरं चान्त । खेटकस्य पादे ॥ ७६ ॥]

सोपानक SII+SII+SII+SII+SII+S and a गाथा.

णेउरभावमणिं सरसं जइ मुत्तिअअं
पच्छेसि पीणपओहरिए फरिसाण जुअम् ।
पाअजुअं च सणेउरअं पुरऊ ठविअं
जाणसु लक्खणअम्मि मणोहरअं दइए ॥ ७७ ॥
इअ पाआण चउण्हवि अन्ते गाहा पउञ्जए जत्थ ।
सोवाणअंति णामं तस्स कईहिं विणिम्माअम् ॥ ७८ ॥

[नूपुरभावमणिं सरसं यदि मौक्तिकम्
प्रेक्षसे पीनपयोधरे स्पर्शयोर्युगम् ।
पादयुगं च सनूपुरं पुरतः स्थापितम्
जानीहि लक्षणे मनोहरं दयिते ॥ ७७ ॥
इति पादानां चतुर्णामपि अन्ते गाथा प्रयुज्यते यत्र ।
सोपानकमिति नाम तस्य कविभिर्विनिर्दिष्टम् ॥ ७८ ॥]

शालभञ्जिका 4+4+4+5+IS.

पढमणिरूविअअं जइ से गअन्दअं
बीअं सन्दणअं तइअं तुरंगअम् ।
जइ बाणासणअं विरमधअगअं
जाणसु मणोहरङ्गिअ सालभञ्जिअम् ॥ ७९ ॥
[प्रथमनिरूपितो यदि अस्या गजेन्द्रः
द्वितीयश्च स्यन्दनस्तृतीयस्तुरङ्गः ।
यदि बाणासनं विरामध्वजाग्रं
जानीहि मनोहराङ्गि (तां) शालभञ्जिकाम् ॥ ७९ ॥]

तल and तालवृन्त.

जइ तिअलअस्स पुरऊ दिज्जइ गाहा तलंति तं जाण ।
पुरऊ अन्ते च जहिं णअङ्गि तं तालविण्ठंति ॥ ८० ॥
[यदि त्रिकलकस्य पुरतो दीयते गाथा तलमिति तज्जानीहि ।
पुरतोऽन्ते च यस्मिन् नताङ्गि तत् तालवृन्तमिति ॥ ८० ॥]

उद्गीतक (S. N.) विषम 4+4+4+4+SIS. सम 4+5+5+IIS+IS.

साअरपाअघडिअपाअक्कतुरंगअं
गअरहविहअणाहविणिऊइअअन्तअम् ।
समरणिउत्ततुरअकरवालरहङ्गअं
पाणिधअग्गएहिं उग्गीअअरूअअम् ॥ ८१ ॥
[सागरपादे घटितपदातितुरङ्गम् । गजरथविहगनाथविनियोजितान्तम् ।
समरनियुक्ततुरगकरवालरथाङ्गम् । पाणिध्वजाग्रैरुद्गीतकरूपकम् ॥८१॥]

मनोरमा 4+4+4+ISI+S.

जइ पेच्छिसि पीणपऊहरिल्लिए
जोहं सरहं तुरअं णरिन्दअम् ।
विरमे कडअं वण्णुज्जलं ठिअं
लक्खणए भण्णइ सा मणोरमा ॥ ८२ ॥

[यदि पश्यसि पीनपयोधरवति । योधं सरथं तुरगं नरेन्द्रम् ।
विरामे कटकं वर्णोज्ज्वलं स्थितम् । लक्षणे भण्यते सा मनोरमा ॥८२॥]

अंतुल्लक 4+ISI+4+4+4+S.

पुरऊ रहं णरिन्दो छउए जइ पाए
णवरिअ गअं विसालं पसअच्छि णिउत्तम् ।
पाइकआण दोण्हं अन्ते जइ चमरं
अन्तुल्लअंति छन्द तं जाण णअङ्गि ॥ ८३ ॥

[पुरतो रथो नरेन्द्रः शाते यदि पादे
अनन्तरं च गजो विशालः प्रसृताक्षि नियुक्तः ।
पदात्योर्द्वयोरन्ते यदि चमरं
अन्तुल्लकमिति छन्दसि तज्जानीहि नताङ्गि ॥ ८३ ॥]

चन्द्रोद्योतक विषम 4+4+4. सम 4+4+4+S.

जइ अ पिए तिण्णि गआ । समरे अहिअं णेउरअम् ।
पसअच्छि विआण सआ । चंदुज्जोअअवित्तमिणम् ॥ ८४ ॥

[यदि च प्रिये त्रयो गजाः । समरे अधिकं नूपुरम् ।
प्रसृताक्षि विजानीहि सदा । चन्द्रोद्योतकवृत्तमिदम् ॥ ८४ ॥]

रासा 4+4+4+SS.

पढमगइन्दणिऊइअएहिं । बीअअतइअतुरंगमएहिं ॥
जाणसु कण्णविरामअएहिं । सुन्दरि रासाअ पाअएहिं ॥ ८५ ॥

[प्रथमगजेन्द्रनियोजितैः । द्वितीयतृतीयतुरङ्गमैः ।
जानीहि कर्णविरामैः । सुन्दरि रासां च पादैः ॥ ८५ ॥]

सदानित, विशेष, चक्कलक, कुलक.

दोहिं संदाणिअअं तिहि गाहाहि अ विसेसअं णाम ।
चउजुत्तं चक्कलअं पञ्चहि कुलअं च णाअव्वम् ॥ ८६ ॥

[द्वाभ्यां संदानितकं तिसृभिर्गाथाभिश्च विशेषकं नाम ।
चतुर्युक्तं चक्कलकं पञ्चभिः कुलकं च ज्ञातव्यम् ॥ ८६ ॥]

णरणाराअणवासुइअणन्तकैलाससंकरमइन्दा ।
दिणअरजीअगुहत्ति अ दस भेआ होंति कुलआणम् ॥ ८७ ॥
परिवाडिअ णामाइं पञ्चारम्भम्मि चोद्दहं जाव ।
एत्ते परेण कव्वं करेइ इच्छाइ वीसद्धो ॥ ८८ ॥

[नरनारायणवासुकिअनन्तकैलासशंकरमहेन्द्राः ।
दिनकरजीवगुहा इति च दश भेदा भवन्ति कुलकानाम् ॥ ८७ ॥
परिपाट्या नामानि पञ्चारम्भे चतुर्दशं यावत् ।
एतैः परेण काव्यं करोतीच्छया विश्रब्धः ॥ ८८ ॥]

सपिण्डितगलिता 5+5+4+4+IS.

सत्तिदण्डकरवालतुरंगगइन्दआ
अन्तअम्मि छअऊरिए सधअग्गआ ।
छन्दअम्मि रमणिज्जसोम्मिआसरिसिए
तं विआण संपिण्डिअअं गलिअं पिए ॥ ८९ ॥
[शक्तिदण्डकरवालतुरङ्गगजेन्द्राः । अन्ते शातोदरि सध्वजाग्राः ।
छन्दसि रमणीयकसौम्यासदृशे । तां जानीहि संपिण्डितां गलितां प्रिये ८९॥]

विशाला (S. N.)

अह रहथण्णगइन्दणरणाहतुरअथणहारसन्दणणरिन्दगअथणहरा सतुरआ ।
पमुहदुमत्तअ णरणाहठाणए जइ हुवन्ति पसअच्छि विप्पआ तो पिए विसाला ॥ ९० ॥
[अथ रथस्तनगजेन्द्रनरनाथतुरगस्तनभारस्यन्दननरेन्द्रगजस्तनभाराः सतुरगाः ।
प्रमुखद्विमात्राः नरनाथस्थाने यदि भवन्ति प्रसृताक्षि विप्रास्ततो प्रिये विशाला ॥ ९० ॥]

विच्छित्ति 2+4+4+4+4+4.

विच्छित्तीअ दुमत्तं तह पञ्च अ जोहा ।
मुद्धे णरवइरहिआ कइसत्थणिउत्ता ॥ ९१ ॥
[विच्छित्तेर्द्विमात्रं तथा पञ्च च योधाः ।
मुग्धे नरपतिरहिता कविसार्थनियुक्ताः ॥ ९१ ॥]

प्रसृता (S. N.)

भामिणि रहणरिन्दपाइक्कराअतुरआ णअङ्गि सुरवारणन्ता ।
पमुहे पसरिआइ णिअमेण होन्ति धवलच्छि दोतइअपञ्च मत्ता ॥ ९२ ॥
[भामिनि रथनरेन्द्रपदातिराजतुरगा नताङ्गि सुरवारणान्ताः ।
प्रमुखे प्रसृताया नियमेन भवन्ति धवलाक्षि द्वे तिस्रः पञ्च मात्राः ॥९२॥]

ललिता 4+4+SIS+4+SIS+S.

पञ्चमतइअसुवण्णआ रअणविरामएसु
कइवसहेहि णिउत्तआ भामिणि कव्वएसु ।
पढमअबीअचउत्थआ महुरक्खरिल्लिएसु
तिण्णिवि मुद्धे जोहआ ललिआपाअएसु ॥ ९३ ॥
[पञ्चमतृतीयौ सुपर्णौ; रत्नविरामेषु
कविवृषभैर्नियुक्ता भामिनि काव्येषु ।
प्रथमद्वितीयचतुर्था मधुराक्षरवत्सु
त्रयोपि मुग्धे योधा ललितापादेषु ॥ ९३ ॥]

विभूषणा II+ISI+SS+ISI+S.

थणहरो सअण्णो णरिन्दओ । पमुहए अ दिण्णो दुमत्तओ ।
पाउ अ ाट्ठि(अंतेविहूसणं) । तं विआण छन्दे विहूसणम् ॥ ९४ ॥
[स्तनहरः सकर्णो नरेन्द्रः । प्रमुखे च दत्तो द्विमात्रः ।
पादेन पादो यदि यमितः। तां विजानीहि छन्दसि विभूषणाम् ॥९४॥]

उद्गता गलिता.

सामुग्गअंति णामेण रूवअं विरइअं मए अंच ।
सा उग्गअत्ति गलिआ जमएहिं पुरिल्लअकएहिं ॥ ९५ ॥
[सामुद्गकमिति नाम्ना रूपकं विरचितं मया यच्च ।
सा उद्गतेति गलिता यमकैः पौरस्त्यकृतैः ॥ ९५ ॥]

लम्बिता 2+4+ISI+4+ISI+4.

पञ्चमतइअएहिं मुद्दे णराहिवेहिं
बीअचउत्थछग्गअतुरअसन्दणेहिं ।
पाआअ पमुहम्मि घडिआ दुमत्तएहिं
जाणह लम्बिआइ गलिआइ पाअएहिं ॥ ९६ ॥
[पञ्चमतृतीयैर्मुग्धे नराधिपैः । द्वितीयचतुर्थषष्ठगजतुरगस्यन्दनैः ।
पादाश्च प्रमुखे घटिता द्विमात्रैः । जानीत लम्बिताया गलितायाः
प्राकृतैः ॥ ९६ ॥]

शुभा 2+4+ISI+4+ISI+2.

पमुहअविरमएसु पाए दुमत्तआ
पञ्चमतइअआअ मुद्धे णरिन्दआ ।
बहुकइसत्थएण बहुसो णिरूविआ
बीअचउत्थजोह ससाणिहिअत्तिसा ॥ ९७ ॥
[प्रमुखविरामयोः पादे द्विमात्रौ । पञ्चमतृतीयौच मुग्धे नरेन्द्रौ ।
बहुकविसार्थेन बहुशो निरूपिता। द्वितीयचतुर्थयोधा शुभेति सा ॥९७॥]

कुमुदिनी 4+4+4+ISI+4+S.

तुरअरहं पाइक्कं णराहिवं जत्थ
दीसइ जत्थ तुरंगं सचामरं अन्ते ।
थोरोरु विअडजहणे सुदीहरच्छिजुए
सा कुमुइणित्ति भणिआ कईहिं णिउणेहिं ॥ ९८ ॥
[तुरगरथौ पदातिर्नराधिपो यत्र । दृश्यते यत्र तुरंगः सचामरोन्ते ॥
स्थविरोरु विकटजघने सुदीर्घाक्षियुते । सा कुमुदिनीति भणिता
कविभिर्निपुणैः ॥ ९८ ॥]

नलिनी 4+5+5+ISI+4+IS.

पढमगइन्दबीअकरवालबन्धसुविहूसिअं
तइअणिउत्तबाणसचउत्थचारुथणहारिअम् ।
सन्दणओ पुणोवि (अ) धअवडएण अइसोहिअं
जाणसु छन्दअम्मि मुद्धमुहिए इमं णलिणिअम् ॥ ९९ ॥
[प्रथमगजेन्द्रद्वितीयकरवालबन्धसुविभूषितां
तृतीयनियुक्तबाणसचतुर्थचारुस्तनहारिणीम् ।
स्यन्दनं पुनरपि च ध्वजपटकेण विभूषितां
जानीहि छन्दसि मुग्धमुखि इमां नलिनीम् ॥ ९९ ॥]

मुखगलिता

खण्डुग्गअत्ति भणिआ जा पढमं सावि होइ मुहगलिआ ।
डंबअपयग्गइणिअमा (?) समं सआ जमिअपाअन्ता ॥ १०० ॥
पञ्चगणा सत्तगणा णवगण-एआरहेहि अ गणेहिं ।
मुहगलिआए भेआ अंसअवट्ठीइ चत्तारि ॥ १०१ ॥
[खण्डोद्गतेति भणिता या प्रथमं सापि भवति मुखगलिता ।
सदा यमितपादान्ता ॥ १०० ॥
पञ्चगणैः सप्तगणैर्नवगणैरेकादशभिश्च गणैः ।
मुखगलितायाः भेदा अंशकवृध्या चत्वारि ॥ १०१ ॥]

पदगलिता 4+4+5

तुरअगइन्दरहङ्गआ । चउसुवि पाएसु जीसे ।
पअगलिआ सा भण्णइ । जमिआ एक्कम्मि पाए ॥ १०२ ॥
[तुरगगजेन्द्ररथाङ्गानि । चतुर्ष्वपि पादेषु यस्याः ।
पदगलिता सा भण्यते । यमिता एकस्मिन्पादे ॥ १०२ ॥]

पदगलिता

सामुग्गअजमएणं जमिआ जा सा विहूसणा णाम ।
अट्ठमजमअणिवद्धा पअगलिआ सा विणाअव्वा ॥ १०३ ॥
[सामुद्गकयमकेन यमिता या सा विभूषणा नाम ।
अष्टमयमकनिबद्धा पदगलिता सा विज्ञेया ॥ १०३ ॥]

विषमगलिता (विषम) 4+ISI+4+S. सम 4+4+ISS+S. (?).

पढमतइआ अ तुरआ अ । बीउ थणहरो मणी अन्ते ।
विसमगलिआइ समरेसुं । गआ दो वावआ मणी अन्ते (?) ॥ १०४ ॥
[प्रथमतृतीयौ च तुरगौ च । द्वितीयः स्तनभारो मणिरन्ते ।
विषमगलितायाः समरयोः । ॥१०४॥]

मालागलितं (S. N.)

जीअ तुरंगवाणरहजुअलअधणुपाइक्करहधयवडा अआ ।
माला इरिसाउत्तह (?) वरकवि (?) सुइसुहअ विरइआ मइ छंदए ॥१०५॥
[यस्यास्तुरंगवाणरथयुगलधनुः पदातिरथध्वजपताकाः ।
माला विरचिता मया छन्दसि ॥१०५॥]
सव्वाणं विअ गलिआण जमअबन्धं कुणन्ति कइवसहा ।
अंशअवसेण एआण तं मए विरइअं णेह ॥ १०६ ॥
[सर्वासामेव गलितानां यमकबन्धं कुर्वन्ति कविवृषभाः ।
अंशकवशेण एतासां तन्मया विरचितं नेह ॥ १०६ ॥]
सव्वासु छन्दजाईसु णरवई एत्थ साहिऊ जत्थ ।
जइ होइ तासु विप्पो दोसोवि न सो गणेअव्वो ॥ १०७ ॥
[सर्वासु छन्दोजातिषु नरपतिरत्र कथितो यत्र ।
यदि भवति तासु विप्रो दोषोपि न सो गणयितव्यः ॥ १०७ ॥]
अण्णं वाहरइ पिआ अण्णं जणणी जहा सिलिम्बाण ।
छन्दे वि तहा मुद्धे जाणसु वित्ताइं णामाइं ॥ १०८ ॥
[अन्यद्व्याहरति पिता अन्यज्जननी यथा बालानाम् ।
छन्दस्यपि तथा मुग्धे जानीहि वृत्तानां नामानि ॥ १०८ ॥]
परिमाणं नत्थिव्विअ णआङ्गि वित्ताण जीअलोअम्मि ।
अणुदिअहं कइसत्थो अज्जवि विरएइ अण्णण्णे ॥ १०९ ॥
[परिमाणं नास्त्येव नताङ्गि वृत्तानां जीवलोके ।
अनुदिवसं कविसार्थोऽद्यापि विरचयत्यन्यदन्यत् ॥ १०९ ॥]
इअ कइसिद्धवित्तजाईसमुच्चए चउत्थो णिअमो संमत्तो ।
[इति कविसिद्ध [or शिष्ट] वृत्तजातिसमुच्चये चतुर्थो नियमः समाप्तः ।]

Index of Metres Defined in the Work.

[The Numbers refer to Chapter and Stanza.]

Following the practice of Hemacandra, I give the names in Sanskrit.

A glossary of Technical Terms.

[For Signs, compare N. B. at the beginning of Notes.]

अशनि = 5.
असि = 5.
उदधि = सागर.
कटक = भूषण.
कदलिका = ध्वज.
कनक = प्रहरण.
कर = IIS.
करपल्लव = कर.
करवाल = असि.
करि = गजेन्द्र.
कर्ण = SS.
कुञ्जर = गजेन्द्र.
कुण्डल = भूषण.
क्षुरप्र = बाण.
गज = गजेन्द्र
गजेन्द्र = 4.
गन्ध = 1.
चरण = SII.
चामर = S.
तुरग = 4.
तोमर = प्रहरण.
द्विज = विप्र.
धनुः = बाणासन.
ध्वज = IS.
ध्वजपताका = ध्वज.
नराधिप = नरेन्द्र.
नरेन्द्र = ISI.
नूपुर = भूषण.
पक्षिनाथ = सुपर्ण.
पटह = III.
पट्टिश = प्रहरण.
पताका = ध्वज.
पदाति = 4.
पद्मराग = भूषण.
पयोधर = स्तन.
पाणि = कर.
पाद = चरण.
पार्थिव = नरेन्द्र.
पुरोधस् = पुरोहित.
पुरोहित = 4 or 5.
प्रहरण = 5.
प्रालम्ब = प्रहरण.
बाण = 5.
बाणासन = 5.
भाव = II.
भुजगेन्द्र = IIIS.
भूमिनाथ = नरेन्द्र.
भूषण = S.
भोगि = भुजगेन्द्र.
मणि = भूषण.
मन्त्री = 4 or 5.
मातङ्ग = गजेन्द्र.
मुक्ता = मौक्तिक.
मुद्गर = प्रहरण.
मौक्तिक = भूषण.
युद्ध = सम.
योध = 4.
रत्न = भूषण.
रत्नाकर = Uneven.
(used of पाद, गण or स्थान.)
रथ = 4.
रथाङ्ग = 5 = प्रहरण.
रव = शब्द.
रस = II.

राजा	= नरेन्द्र.	सम	= even (used of पाद, गण or स्थान.)
रूप	= I.	समर	= सम.
वारण	= गजेन्द्र.	समुद्र	= रत्नाकर.
विप्र	= IIII.	सागर	= रत्नाकर.
विभूषण	= भूषण.	सामन्त	= नरेन्द्र.
विषधर	= भुजगेन्द्र.	सुपर्ण	= SIS.
विषम	= रत्नाकर.	सुरगज	= ISS.
विहगाधिपति	= सुपर्ण.	सुरवारण	= सुरगज.
विहंगपति	= सुपर्ण.	स्तन	= ISI.
वैजयन्ती	= ध्वज.	स्पर्श	= I.
शक्तिदण्ड	= प्रहरण.	स्यन्दन	= रथ.
शब्द	= I.	हरि	= तुरंग.
शर	= बाण.	हस्त	= कर.
शरासन	= बाणासन.	हस्ती	= गजेन्द्र.
शिलीमुख	= बाण.	हार	= भूषण.
संयुग	= सम.		

NOTES.

N. B.—Usually the metres contain four Pādas each. The sign I represents a short letter and S represents a long one. The numbers 2, 3, 4 and 5 used as symbols represent respectively the groups of 2, 3, 4 and 5 Mātrās regardless of the letters of which they consist. Where particular groups are intended, they are represented by the signs. References to Hemacandra are to the edition of his Chandonuśāsana published by Devakaraṇa Mulaji, Bombay, 1912 (N. S. Press). References to Piṅgala are to the edition of the Prākṛta Piṅgala Sūtras, published in the Kāvyamālā Series Bombay, 1894.

CHAPTER I.

12. For the six Pratyayas or modifications of the metres cf. Hemacandra, p. 46 b.

13. संयोगपढम, &c.—The letter preceding a conjunction (*i.e.* a conjunct letter), if this latter is stressed, is long. Cf. Piṅgala I. 3 ff and तीव्रप्रयत्नसंयोगपूर्वस्य गौरवं, अतीव्रप्रयत्नसंयोगस्य लाघवमेव—Com.

14. कुडिलोज्जुअग्गं :—Cf. ऋजु स्पष्टमग्रं प्रान्तो यस्य तत् ऋज्वग्रम् । कुटिलं वक्रम् । कुटिलं च तदृज्वग्रं कुटिलर्ज्वग्रम्.—Com. A long letter should be

represented by a curve with a straight line at either end (S). Its length should be equal to that of the joint of the thumb. A short letter should be represented by a (vertical) straight line of the same length (I).

15. Cf. ' लघुकला मात्रा । चतस्रो मात्रा यस्यासौ चतुर्मात्रः । अंशो गण इति पर्यायः ।—Com. The five kinds of a Gaṇa of four Mātrās are :— सर्वगुरु SS ; अन्तगुरु IIS, मध्यगुरु ISI ; प्रमुखेगुरु SII and सर्वलघु IIII.

16. In this verse, the eight kinds of a Pañcamātra (group of five Mātrās) are enumerated. They are ISS ; SIS ; IIIS ; SSI ; IISI ; ISII ; SIII ; IIIII.

17. The words गज, रथ, तुरङ्ग and पदाति with their synonyms are used to signify a Caturmātra in general and the names of weapons, to signify a Pañcamātra in general. Cf. Piṅgala, I. 12-13 ; 26.

18-19. Among the Caturmātras, कर्ण is the special name of SS ; कर of IIS ; पयोधर of ISI ; चरण of SII and विप्र of IIII. Piṅgala has the same names. Cf. I. 13.

20-21. The group ISI is also known by another name, i.e., नरेन्द्र. The reading of the third line of v. 21 as known to the Com. seems to be ' मज्जाआ विअ जाई ' मर्यादेव जातीः; cf. यथा मर्यादा ब्राह्मणादीनां जातीनां यथोचितस्थाने स्थिताः ताः भूषयति.—Com. Also cf. Piṅga la, I. 21

22-25. This group, i.e., ISI, should not be employed in the uneven places of गाथा, स्कन्धक, गीति and उपगीति metres. In the sixth place of all these metres except उपगीति, even a द्विज (i.e., IIII) group may be employed if the नरेन्द्र group is not available. When, however, a द्विज (i.e., IIII) is thus employed in the *sixth* place, let the *first* of its four syllables be an independent word, i.e., let the first letter be either an independent word or let it at least be the last letter of a word and let a new word be begun with the *second* letter of the group. V. 25 provides an example : the sixth group is ग्मि कुणसु, which is a द्विज or विप्र (i.e. IIII), the word ends with the first letter and a new word is begun with the second. If on the other hand, this group (i.e., IIII) is employed in the *second* or the *fifth* place, its first letter should never be joined with the letters of the previous group

so as to form a word i.e., let a new word be commenced with the first letter of this group when it stands in the *second* or the *fifth* place. Cf. यदा षष्ठे विप्रवरो भवति तदास्य प्रथमे वर्णे कुरु नित्यपदं अवश्यं तदा तत्र पदसमाप्तिर्विधेया । चत्वारो वर्णाः साकल्येन तावत्तस्मिन्संभवन्ति तत्र प्रथमे विच्छेदो विधेयः । तथा इह 'म्मि कुणसु' इति 'विप्रे' समभ्यन्तस्य पदस्य विधानं दर्शितम् । अथवा यदि द्वितीयेऽथ पञ्चमे स्थाने स्थितो भवति ततोऽस्य प्रवरवर्णं पूर्वपदेन सह वर्जयेत् । एतदुक्तं भवति । चतुर्थगणपदस्यान्ते समाप्तिः कार्या द्विजे पञ्चमे सति । अनन्तरं च पञ्चमे पदमारब्धव्यमिह यथा 'तो से' इति चतुर्थगणे समाप्ते 'परिहर इति पञ्चमपदस्यारब्धिर्दर्शिता ।—Com.

26. In अधिकाक्षरा, निर्वापिता, बाणासिका and शीर्षक metres, the नरेन्द्र (i.e., ISI) group is always allowed in the uneven places. This is an exception to the rule given in v. 22.

27. The three Pañcamātra groups with a long letter at the end (these are ISS, SIS and IIIS) are respectively called सुरगज, गरुड and भुजगेन्द्र, (the synonyms of these words are also used). For other different names of these, cf. Piṅgala, I. 24-25.

28. A long letter is known by the names of the different jewels and ornaments or by the words मणि, रत्न, आभरण and चमर. A group of *three* Mātrās including a long letter at the end (IS) is known by the names of ध्वजपटक and कदलिका ; one with all the three short letters is known by the names of musical instruments. A Gaṇa with two short letters is called either रस or भाव, and a single short letter is known by the names of शब्द, स्पर्श, रूप and गन्ध. Cf. Piṅgala, I. 14, 27-28.

31. गणसमा द्विपदी cf. below III. 38-44. विषधराभ्यां=कम्बलाश्वतराभ्याम् —Com.

32-33 समर or सम is used in the sense of 'even,' सागर or विषम is used in the sense of 'odd,' whether it be a पाद, गण or स्थान in the metre. मन्त्री and पुरोहित are names which are used to denote *any one* of the five Caturmātrās and eight Pañcamātrās without distinction. Thus where a मन्त्री or पुरोहित Gaṇa is prescribed, any one of these 13 may be used. On v. 32 the Commentator refers to an older interpretation of the stanza.

CHAPTER II.

1-8. According to this definition, a द्विपदी consists of four वस्तुकs and four गीतिs. Cf. एतदुक्तं भवति । वस्तुकस्यान्ते प्रत्येकशो गीतिः कार्या । गीतिकया वर्तन्ते इति सगीतिकानि । सगीतिकानि च तानि वस्तुकानि सगीतिकवस्तुकानि चत्वारि द्विपदीति निर्दिष्टा ।—Com. Sometimes a विचारी, एकक, द्विपथक or विस्तारितक is inserted between the वस्तुक and the गीति. The गीति, however, is to be dropped if a ध्रुवका is employed after a वस्तुक.

2-3. गीति has got two lines, each has *seven* Gaṇas followed by a long letter. Of these seven, the *third* and the *seventh* are Pañcamātras (धनु and शर); the rest are Caturmātras (योध), the sixth being either a राजा (ISI) or a विप्र (IIII). So the formula of the line is 4+4+5+4+4+ISI or IIII+5+S. See Hemacandra, p. 27b, l. 18; also cf. Piṅgala, I. 61, who gives the name उद्गाथ to this metre. The line of a गीति may even have the *second* and the *fourth* or the *first* and the *fifth* Gaṇas as the Pañcamātras instead of the *third* and the *seventh*. Cf. अत्र चैवं विनियमयन्ति । तृतीयानां पञ्चमात्रादीनां सप्तमादिर्यथोक्तैव सहयोगे भवति नान्यथेति । तेन यदा तृतीयः पञ्चमात्रस्तदा सप्तमो, यदा द्वितीयस्तदा चतुर्थो यदा पञ्चमस्तदा प्रथम इति ।—Com.

6. विस्तारितक is a metre which partly resembles and partly does not resemble the द्विपदी. It resembles the द्विपदी in its construction but differs from it in point of length. It has only one or two or three Pādas as against the four of a द्विपदी.

7. A stanza in the विचारी metre which completes or supplements the sense of the वस्तुक and is repeated at the end of each वस्तुक (or द्विपदी) is called a ध्रुवका. (Cf. ध्रुवपद or स्थायिपद.) विषधराभ्यां नागाभ्याम् —Com.

8. 'भुजगाधिपौ कम्बलाश्वतरौ; सातवाहनो राजा; वृद्धकविर्हरिवृद्ध इति केचित् ।' —Com.

10-16. Of the 60 द्विपदीs, the first 37 are Mātrāgaṇasama, i.e., all the four pādas of these resemble each other in point of Mātrās and Gaṇas. The next 7 are Gaṇasama, i.e., they resemble each other in point of the number of the Gaṇas, but the number of their Mātrās differs. The next 8 are Ardhasama, i.e., the first and third, and the second and fourth pādas of these resemble each other in

point of both their Mātrās and Gaṇas. The last eight are merely enumerated by the author but not defined as they are not important. Hemacandra (p. 32a, line 18) refers to these varieties but does not define them.

CHAPTER III.

1. सुमना: The formula of a Pāda is: 4+4+4 (except IIS and SS)+S. The third '4' is करकण्णविवज्जिअ.

3. ज्योत्स्ना—A Pāda has 5+5+S. In the example the two Pañcamātras are respectively SIS and IIIS in all the four Pādas. These are usually recommended for the seven Gaṇasama Dvipadis; see I. 30.

5. कौमुदी—The textreads कोमुईअ पया सोहिअऊ in the third line. This is metrically wrong. I have restored कहिं from the words 'कथं शोभित:' in the Commentary. Similarly विरमईअ in the fourth line is doubtful; I suggest विरमअम्मि.

7. रक्ता—In the text, the stanza has five lines. Of these the fourth, i.e., दीसइत्ति नेउरं is not supported by the Commentary nor is it necessary; hence I have not inserted it.

10. पद्मिनी—A Pāda has 4+4+5+S. The *second* '4' may be ISI.

11. विद्युत्—A Pāda has either 4+4+4+5, or 4+5+4+4. A चाप (i.e. 5) is to be placed after the *first* or the *third* of the three तुरंगमs. In the stanza, it comes after the *first* in Pādas 2-4 and after the *third* in Pāda 1.

12. विनता—A Pāda contains three पार्थिवs (ISI) with three तुरंगs (4) which must include one or more हस्तs (IIS), and a चाप (5) followed by रत्न (S). Thus we get 4+ISI+4+ISI+4+ISI+5+S. The '4's must include one or more IIS. Thus in the verse, they are 2 in the first, 2 in the second, 1 in the third, and 3 in the fourth line.

20. नन्दिनी—A Pāda has four pairs of रस (II) and नूपुर (S), i.e., IIS+IIS+IIS+IIS, or four करs.

21. श्री—A Pāda contains four pairs of रस (II) and नूपुर (S) followed by a स्पर्श (I), a रव (i.e., शब्द=I) and a भूषण (S), i.e., five करs IIS+IIS+IIS+II+IIS+IIS.

22. चन्द्रकान्ता—A Pāda contains 4+5+4+IIS. करंतासंतिआ means having a कर (IIS) at the end.

25-26 रचिता—A Pāda has 4+5+5+IIS+IIS+ISI+S. In the place of the two करs (IIS), however, we may have ordinary स्यन्दनs (4), and in the place of the पार्थिव (ISI) we may have a विप्र (IIII).

30. लक्ष्मी—A Pāda has 4+5+5+5+ISS. The text is very unsatisfactory. In the first line it reads पुरऊ पुरऊअ for पुरउअ. In the third it reads पेच्छसि ससिसमाणणे रूवं only and in the fourth सहिअणाण सुईसुहअम्मि। The Com. runs as follows :—नियमितं क्षुरप्रं पुरतश्च योधश्च (स्य) पट्टिशं रथाङ्गं मार्गतः सुरगजस्य पश्य शशिसमानने उत्सुकं सहृदयानां श्रुति-सुभगे मुग्धे पादे च लक्ष्म्याः । लक्ष्म्याः पादे इदमिदं पश्यत उत्सुकं उत्कण्ठितं कृत्वा किं तच्चतुर्मात्रस्य पुरतोग्रे क्षुरप्रंच पञ्चमात्रं नियमितम् । क्षुरप्रसंज्ञा शरविशेषस्य । पश्चात्पट्टिश-रथाङ्गे । पञ्चमात्रं पट्टिशः आयुधविशेषः । सुरगजस्यादिलघोः मार्गतः पश्चाद्भागे । सहृदयानां श्रुतिसुभग इति । This would show that we have the following order of the Gaṇas in the Pāda: 4+5+5+5+ISS. In the third line, I supply उच्छुअं पाए from the Com. I have changed पुरऊ to पुरउ in the first, and पेछसि to पेच्छ in the second, for metrical reasons. In the last line, for the same reason, I read सहिआण for साहिअणाण and सुइसुह or सुईसुह; but how can सहिआण be सहृदयानां ? Should we read (against Com.) सहिअअअणसुइसुहअम्मि (सहृदयजनश्रुतिसुखे) for सहिअणाण सुईसुहअम्मि ?

32-33. अश्वाक्रान्ता—A Pāda has SII+SII+SII+SII+SII+S. We have हार (S)+रस (II)+नूपुर (S)+गन्ध (I)+two पार्थिवs (ISI+ISI)+ पयोधर (ISI)+स्पर्श (I)+मणि (S).

34. संगता—A Pāda has seven SII Gaṇas. Cf. आदिगुरुभिः सप्तभिश्चतुर्मात्रैः संगतापादो भवतीति तात्पर्यम् ।—Com.

35. मालती—A Pāda has 4+4+4+4+4+5+S. In the odd places, a रतन (ISI) may be used.

38. वंशस्था—A Pāda has 4+5+5+IIS+4+4+IIS. Com :— वंशस्थायाः पादे विरामे अन्ते रतनूपुरौ कुरु इत्यर्थः ।

40. चित्रा—This and the following six Dvipadis Gaare ṇasama, i.e., their Pādas resemble each other in the number of Gaṇas they have, but not in the number of Mātrās which these contain.

A Pāda of चित्रा has II or S+4+ISI or IIII+4 or 5+4+5+S. The fourth Gaṇa may either be a Caturmātra or a Pañcamātra. मन्त्री=4 or 5 ; cf. I. 33. In the fifth place, again, where a तुरंग (4) is prescribed, a स्तन (ISI) may occur.

42. भद्रा—A Pāda has 4 or 5+4+5+4+4+5 ; in the *second* and *fifth* places a भूमिनाथ (ISI) may occur.

43. गन्धारि—In a Pāda, we have first *two* पुरोहितs (4 or 5), then a पार्थिव or a विप्र (ISI or IIII) followed by a बाण (5).

45. रुद्र—A Pāda has a मन्त्री (4 or 5), a तुरंग (4) and a शक्तिदण्ड (5); in the *second* place a स्तन (ISI) is allowed.

46. ललिता—A Pāda has 4 or 5+4+5+4 or 5+5+S. In the verse, the मन्त्री in both the places of all Pādas is a Caturmātra.

47. विपुला and the following seven are Ardhasama. The form of the *even* Pādas of these differs from that of the *odd* ones. Thus the odd Pādas of विपुला are made up of a कर and a सुरगज, i.e., IIS+ISS; while the even Pādas contain a Caturmātra more at the beginning, i.e., 4+IIS+ISS. Hemacandra does not discuss these varieties of a Dvipadī, but merely dismisses them with the remark that they are included in other metres discussed by him. Cf. p. 32a, l. 18.

CHAPTER IV.

1. गाथा—It contains 16 Gaṇas of which the *eighth* and the *sixteenth* consist of a single long letter (मणि); the *fourteenth* consists of a single short letter (गन्ध). The *sixth* is a Caturmātra of the स्तन type (ISI) or of the द्विज type (IIII) ; and the remaining *ten* are the ordinary Caturmātras (योध). In a गाथा, there can be any number of *letters* from 30 to 55. A गाथा which contains the least number of letters (namely 30) is called लक्ष्मी; in it there are 27 long letters and 3 short ones. (These three compulsory short letters are :—1 which forms the 14th Gaṇa and 2 and 3 which are contained in the 6th Gaṇa which is स्तन). A गाथा which contains the largest number of letters, i.e., 55 is called हंसवधू. In a हंसवधू, we have all short letters except the last letters of the two halves. The author

merely gives an instance of this type in v. 4. I do not know from where the verse is quoted. For गाथा, cf. Piṅgala, I. 49 ff.

5-8. We get the different varieties of गाथा by removing long letters (रत्न) in them and by adding two short ones (रस) in their place. Thus beginning with लक्ष्मी and ending with हंसवधू we get 26 varieties, e. g., in लक्ष्मी there are 27 long letters and 3 short ones ; in श्रद्धा there are 26 long letters and 5 short ones ; in बुद्धि there are 25 long letters and 7 short ones and so on Vv. 6-7 give the names of the different varieties. For other names cf. Hemacandra p. 27 b, line 14 ff. Piṅgala's names (cf. I.49-55) are nearly the same as ours.

9-12. In the स्कन्धक metre, in both the halves, we have a नरेन्द्र (ISI) group, preceded by *five* and followed by *two* वारणs (4). In each line thus, we have 8 Caturmātra groups, of which the *sixth* is always ISI. A स्कन्धक may possess from 34 to 62 letters. For the least number of *short* letters which it can possess is 4 (2 of each of the two नरेन्द्र groups), then it can have 30 long letters. Thus the least number of *long* letters it may have is 2 (one of each of the two नरेन्द्र groups), then it can have 60 short letters. Thus there are 29 varieties of a स्कन्धक This, however, seems to be slightly inaccurate. For the least number of *long* letters which a स्कन्धक can have is not 2, but 4; for in addition to the 2 long letters of the two नरेन्द्र groups, the letters at the end of each half must be long ; cf. I. 13. Thus we may have only 27 varieties and not 29.

According to Piṅgala (I. 63-65), the two नरेन्द्र groups do not seem to be compulsory in a स्कन्धक, but cf. his Commentator's remark on v. 65 :—षष्ठे जगणस्यावश्यकत्वात् चत्वारो लघवइत्युक्तम् । This rule, however, is not observed in v. 63a. According to v. 65 the four short letters may occur anywhere. Also cf. Hemacandra, p. 28b, l. 14 ff., who agrees with Virahāṅka. The names of the varieties given in vv. 11-12 differ from those of Hemacandra and Piṅgala.

13. गीति—The allusion to ' Piṅgala ' seems to be merely conventional, for according to our author ' Piṅgala ' calls the metre गीति;

while according to Piṅgala I. 61, 'Piṅgala' calls it उद्गाथ! For the metre, also cf. above II. 2-3.

14. उपगीति—By the invertion of the halves of a गाथा is obtained an उपगीति. It is called विगाथा at Piṅgala I. 60. Our author and Piṅgala both quote the authority of 'Piṅgala' for the name which they give to the metre. Hemacandra agrees with our author. Cf. p. 28 a, l. 7 ff.

15. विलासिनी—A Pāda contains 2 बाणs (5) which have a मणि i.e., long letter at the end (these are IIIS; ISS or SIS) followed by a पार्थिव (ISI) and नूपुर (S). This metre is different from the विलासिनी द्विपदी defined in III. 29.

16. निर्वापिता—A Pāda has 4+4+ISI or IIII+5. Hemacandra p. 33a, l. 2 ff. gives several varieties of this metre, which, by the way, he calls निज्झाइआ (निध्यायिका); of these, only the first agrees with ours.

17. बाणासिका—A Pāda has 4+4+ISI or IIII+IIS or SS. This differs from the previous one only in the last Gaṇa.

18. खञ्जक—It has in the *uneven* Pādas 4+SIS and in the *even* ones 4+II+SIS. रस = II. According to both Hemacandra, p. 31b, l. 10 ff and Piṅgala, I. 124-25, खञ्जक is a मात्रागणसम metre whereas according to our author it is अर्धसम. Their खञ्जक differs from ours even in other respects.

21. क्रीडनक—A Pāda has 4+4+4+SIS or IIIS+IS. Hemacandra, p. 32b, l. 8, agrees; he, however, does not restrict the *fourth* Gaṇa to SIS or IIIS.

22. तरङ्गक—A Pāda has SII+SII +SII+SII+SS. Hemacandra's तरङ्गक has 21 Mātrās in a Pāda, irrespective of the quantity of the letters; cf. p. 32b, l. 18.

23. साम्या—This metre is used only in Sanskrit; hence the example is given in Sanskrit. It has 5+S+4+S+ISI or SIS. I am, however, not sure about the text; cf. यस्य प्रथमं मुद्गरो भवति पश्चाद्धारेस्वर: (?) (तदनु) योध: तस्य चाग्रत: पुरो मौक्तिकं गुरु: किं च पार्थिव:। जातु कदाचित्तं तु चतुर्भागे मात्रयाधिकं विद्धि। ० अपरमपि दर्शितं यत्संस्कृतेनैतच्छन्द्यं वृत्तं निबध्यते।—Com.

24. अधिकाक्षरा—A Pāda contains *five* Caturmātras and *one* Pañcamātra at the end of these; a स्तन (ISI) might occur in the uneven places; in the *third*, नरेन्द्र (ISI) or a द्विज (IIII) must occur. Hemacandra (p. 33 a, l. 8 ff.) wholly agrees, except in the last condition. The 'Yati' is after the 12th and the 25th Moras.

25. नर्कुटक—A Pāda has 4+5+5+4+SS. The two Pañcamātras must be either भोगि (IIIS) or सुरहास्ति (ISS) or सुपर्ण (SIS). For the latter half, cf. कुला देशीपदं पत्तिपर्याय: तेनैतदुक्तं भवति । अंतिमो विसर्गो दीर्घवर्णेन एकारेण विलुप्तो यस्य भवति । पादान्ते विसर्गस्य स्थान्यादेशभावेन 'आए' इति विधेयमित्यर्थ: । This change of विसर्ग is unknown to Hemacandra; in other respects he agrees, cf. p. 32b, l. 14 ff.

27. द्विपथक—Its Pāda has 4+4+4+S+4+4+SS. It has only *two* Pādas. This is the same as the दोहा of Piṅgala, I, 66 ff., who, however, regards it as a metre with four Pādas.

28. मागधिका—If in a वैतालीय metre (See IV. 48) the syllables र and स are respectively pronounced as ल and ष (श ?) it is called मागधिका. The verse is an instance. In the text we are probably to read रसौ लशौ । जइ आभाशशि चालुणित्तिए । e मुणेशु शुन्दलि ॥ for in मागधी language स is changed to श and र to ल. Cf. Pischel, Grammatik, sec. 229; 285. Cf. वैतालीयस्य लक्षणं वक्ष्यति । तस्मिन्यदा रेफसकारौ यथासंख्येन लसौ (शौ ?) भाषसे उच्चारयसि तदा तां मागधिकामित्यस्मिल्लक्षणे निर्मितामिति मुणेसु जानीहि । एतदुक्तं भवति । वैतालीयमेव मागधिकया भाषया समुच्चारणात् ।'—Com.

29-30. मात्रा—"The Pādas of the मात्रा metre, which belong to an uneven metre (i.e., which resemble those of an uneven metre, and are two and three (i.e., five) in number, are formed with the Gaṇas consisting of long and short letters (without any particular sequence). The following characteristics of the middle ones (*i.e.*) 1, 3 and 5) of these Pādas are given by the learned:—These Pādas of the करही मात्रा are made with 13 Mātrās; of मोदनिका with 14; of चारुनेत्री with 15 and of राहुसेनी with 16 Mātrās." The 2nd and the 4th Pādas of these four मात्राs are respectively formed with 11, 12, 13 and 14 Mātrās, according to the commentator, who seems to be right since this is found to be the case in vv. 29 and 30, which the author gives as examples of चारुनेत्री and मोद-

निवा मात्राs respectively. (The words मात्रा चारुनेत्तिआ and दुवहऊ मोअणिआसंजुत्तऊ रड्डा occur at the end of vv. 29 and 31 respectively in the text). Hemacandra, p. 36 a, l. 8 ff, gives several varieties of this metre, the chief among which is the one with the five Pādas containing 16, 12, 16, 12 and 16 Mātrās respectively. None of our varieties are mentioned by him. Piṅgala, I. 109-115 mentions *seven* varieties, of which the करही of v, 109 alone agrees with our करही. It should be noted that in v. 29, there are only 12 Mātrās in the *second* Pāda, in the *fifth* ए in णिउणपहिं is to be read as short. In v. 30, we are probably to drop भोदि and read करहिअ तेरह मत्ताइं in the *first* Pāda. Cf. पञ्चपादा विषमच्छन्दसोऽसदृशाक्षरा भवन्ति। मणिरूपेत्यादिना मात्राणां गुरुलघुरचनां अभ्यनुज्ञातवान्। नामभेदमाश्रित्य मध्यमानां लक्षणं निरूपितं न (तु) मध्यमानामेव। यस्मात्प्रथमतृतीयपञ्चमाः त्रयोदशभ्यो मात्राभ्य आरभ्य षोडश यावत् विधेयाः। एवं द्वितीयचतुर्थौ एकादशभ्यः चतुर्दश यावत् इत्युदाहरणात् शास्त्रान्तरेभ्यो लक्ष्याच्च अस्माभिरधिगतम्। यदि नामाचार्यस्यैवमभिमतं न स्यात् तदग्रे 'दुवईण गणप्पमाण'मित्यादि स्ववचनविरोधः स्यात्। यस्मात्पादेष्वनियमे मात्राणां न केवलं लघुक्रियाया विघटनं यावत्संख्याया अपीति। **अपभ्रंशेन** मात्रा रचनीया इत्यपि उदाहरणेन दर्शितम्॥ यथा मध्यमपादे लक्षणं निरूपितं तथाह–करहीति। स इति मध्यमपादपरामर्शः। 'करैत्यादीनां तिसृणां यथासंख्येन त्रयोदशचतुर्दशपञ्चदशमात्राः भवन्ति। यस्याः स षोडशमात्रास्तस्या राहुसेनेति नाम।—Com. The metre is always to be composed in the Apabhransha language.

31. When a द्विपथक (i.e., दोहा) occurs at the end of any one of these मात्राs, the metre is called रड्डा. Compare Hemacandra, p. 36b, 15 and Piṅgala I. 106-107.

32-34. अडिला—Any good metre is called अडिला if the आभीरि language is employed in it, and if the Pādas are rhymed.

विणिएप्पिणु-विनिरूप्य—v. 32. What is the metre of the stanza? V. 33 contains a definition as well as an example of the अडिला metre, the formula of the Pāda seems to be 4+5+5+1S. V. 34 is merely an example of अडिला which is really a नर्कुटक (cf. IV. 25 in the text the words अडिला नक्कडभेएण occur at the end of v. 34) with the आभीरी language used in it. cf. आभीर्या भाषया तथा यमकेनोपलक्षितस्य अडिलेति नाम भवति।—Com. For a different definition, cf. Piṅgala I. 103 and Hemacandra, p. 37a, l. 19. For the explanation of v. 34 cf. सरसो जलाशयस्यान्तरमैनोत्तरं (?) सरन्ती गच्छति। किंभूतं सरोन्तरम्।

पङ्कजसङ्कटैः सलिलैरुपलक्षितम् । किं भूता घोरणी । सरन्तृका । रमत इति रन्ता प्रियः । सह रन्त्रा वर्तते या सा सरन्तृका । अथवा सरसः अन्तः सरोन्तः तत्र भवा सरोन्त्या । सरोन्त्या एव सरोन्तिका । अन्यच्च किं भूतं सरोन्तरम् । ···कुमुदैरुपलक्षितम् । तत्र च सरोन्तरे तासां भ्रमरपङ्क्तीनां स्वरान्तरो ध्वनिविशेषः विकसति । वंशैः मिश्रित इव मिश्रितो मधुरत्वात् । वंसहु is Instru. plural—Com.

35-36. ढोसा–This name is given to a Gāthā when it is composed in the Māravāḍī language and when *in each half*, the *fourth* caturmātrā is either a सामन्त (ISI) or a द्विज (IIII). Vv. 35 and 36 are examples; in the first, a सामन्त is used in the fourth place in both the halves; in the second, a द्विज is used in the first half and a सामन्त in the second.

37-38. A रासक is made up of several (?) द्विपदीs or विस्तारितs ending in a विचारी or of several अडिल्लs, द्विपथs, मात्राs, रड्डाs or ढोसाs.

39-40. मालाशीर्षक—It contains four Pādas, having an equal number of Caturmātrās followed by a Pañcamātra in each and a Gīti at the end. The sentence must not be completed in the four Pādas but must run into the Gīti. Again the *third* Caturmātra must be a स्तन (ISI) or a विप्र (IIII). The other *uneven* Caturmātras may be नरनाथ (ISI); long compounds with syllables agreeable to the ear should be used. In the example, *eleven* Caturmātras are used in each Pāda. For another definition of a शीर्षक and its varieties, cf. Hemacandra, p. 33 b, l. 15 ff.

41-42. अधिकाक्षरशीर्षक—A Stanza in the अधिकाक्षरा metre (cf. IV. 24) followed by a Gīti is called अधिकाक्षरशीर्षक.

43-45. त्रिकलक or निर्वापिताशीर्षक—A त्रिकलक is made up of a stanza in the अधिकाक्षरा metre, followed by another in the निर्वापिता metre (cf. IV. 15) and a Gīti. V. 45 is not given in the text; only the words तिअलअं मालासीसअं are found between v. 43 and 44. At the end of v. 44 again, the words अणिद्दिट्ठसमरूविअं are found. I have reconstructed v. 45 from the commentary. It seems to mean that in the place of the अधिकाक्षरा stanza, another one, having four Pādas containing an equal number of Caturmātras like those of the first stanza of a मालाशीर्षक, may occur. Cf. अधिकाक्षरशीर्षकस्य य एवार्थस्तस्मिन्नेव निर्वापिता विरचनीयेत्यर्थः । अस्यैव त्रिकलकमिति निर्वापिताशीर्षकमिति च

नामद्वयमित्यर्थः । उदाहरणपूरणार्थं गीतिकामाह—मालासीसअ इति । मालाशीर्षकनाम्नि इच्छा-समसंख्यांशानियमेन यल्लक्षणं प्रियतमे तदेव कथितमस्मिन्त्रिकलके । एतच्छिष्याणां विस्पष्टार्थं पुनर्लक्षणमुक्तम् । एवं चतुर्भी रूपकैः (?) त्रिकलको भणितः ।—Com.

46. दण्डक—It has four Pādas, each containing 6 short letters at the beginning, followed by the same number पक्षिनाथ (SIS) groups. In the third line we are to read रसरवफरिसेसु for रसरत॰ cf. Piṅgala II. 294ff.

47. खण्डोद्गता—Even with the help of the Commentary, I am unable to restore the correct text. This seems to be an अर्धसम metre. The *uneven* Pādas are made up of Caturmātras which are either कर (IIS) or कर्ण (SS), while the *even* ones are made with the same number of Caturmātras, the Gaṇas in the *second* and *third* places, however, being always the Pañcamātras. At the end of *all* the Pādas, a Trimātra (IS) is to be placed. The नरेन्द्र Caturmātra may be used in the even places but never in the uneven ones. The Trimātra at the end is IS according to the Commentary :—सर्वपदानामन्ते त्रिमात्रोन्तगुरुः कर्तव्य इति । Hemacandra's खण्डोद्गता (cf. p. 31 a, line 9ff.) is much different. According to him, it is मात्रागणसम and a Pāda contains IIS or SS+5+4+4+4+4+4+5. Also cf. IV. 100-101 below.

48. वैतालीय—This is an अर्धसम metre, the uneven Pādas have 2+2+2+SIS+IS. In the *even* Pādas a रस (II) or नूपुर (S) is added to these *at the beginning*.

49. औपच्छन्दसिक—When a भूषण (S) is added *at the end*, to the Pādas of वैतालीय, it becomes औपच्छन्दसिक. For the two metres cf. Hemacandra, p. 23b.

50. आपातलिका—This too is अर्धसम. The *uneven* Pādas have 2+2+2+SII+SS. In the *even* Pādas, a रस (II) or मणि(S) is added to these at the beginning.

51. In the even Pādas of these three metres, i.e., वैतालीय, औपच्छन्दसिक and आपातलिका, six short letters *in succession* should not be used.

52. उद्गता—A Pāda has 4+5+5+any number of Caturmātras which must be the same in all the other pādas. The Pañcamātra in the *third* place is usually a सुरगज (ISS). The नरेन्द्र Caturmātra

may occur in the *even* places. The उद्गता of Piṅgala II. 322 is wholly different.

56. सामुद्गक—A Pāda has 4+5+5+4+4+4+SS. A स्तन group may occur in the even places. To complete the sentence, supply पादा भवन्ति in the stanza.

58-59. नाराचक —The name नाराचक cannot occur in a stanza in that metre, hence the name is separately mentioned by a Gāthā. In a Pāda of this metre, we get IS+IS+IS+IS. रूप and रव both are=I ; cf. I. 29.

60. ललिता—A Pāda contains *five* Caturmātras followed by a a long letter. The Caturmātras in the even places may be नराधिप (ISI). रण=even places. The Pādas are always rhymed.

63. उत्फुल्लक—This has two Pādas each having 4+4+4+4+4 SS, and is very similar to द्विपथक (cf. IV. 27), which has only an additional long letter between the *third* and the *fourth* Caturmātras.

64-65. संगतक—It has four Pādas, followed by a Gāthā. In each Pāda we have SII+SII+SS+SII+SII+S.

66. विन्दुतिलक—This is an अर्धसम metre. In the *uneven* Pādas we get 4+4+4+S ; in the *even* ones, we have 4+4+5+IS.

69. चतुष्पद—This has four Pādas. The *first* has SIS+SIS+SS, the *second* has III+II+I+IIS. *Third* and *fourth* have each 5+SIS. पडह=III; cf. I. 29. The चतुष्पदी of Piṅgala, I. 81 is entirely different.—cf.प्रथमे पादौ पक्षिनाथौ द्वौ कर्णश्च । द्वितीये पटहश्च रसश्च रवश्च करश्च । पटहस्त्रिलघुगणः। तृतीयचतुर्थयोश्च पृथक् चापो विहगाधिपतिश्चेति ।—Com.

70—एकक A चतुष्पद joined with an अवलम्बक and (or ?) an एकक is called एक्का. I am unable to understand the verse.

73. खडहडक—This is made up of a stanza in the भ्रमरावलि metre (cf. IV. 61) and a Gāthā. Vv. 74-75 are an example probably from an older work.

77-78. सोपानक—When a stanza having four Pādas, each containing *five* Caturmātras of the SII type and a *long* letter at the end, is joined with a Gātha, it is called सोपानक. पादयुगं=a pair of चरणs i.e., SII groups.

79. शालभञ्जिका—Four Pādas, each having 4+4+4+5+IS; cf. Hemacandra, p. 32a, l. 11ff.

80. तल—A pair of a त्रिकलक and a गाथा is called तल and when a त्रिकलक is both preceded and followed by a गाथा, it is called तालवृन्त.

81. उद्गतक—This is an अर्धसम metre. The *uneven* Pādas have each of them four Caturmātras followed a विहगनाथ (SIS). The *even* Pādas have 4+5+5+IIS+IS in each.

84. चन्द्रोद्योतक—This is अर्धसम; *uneven* Pāda contains *three* Caturmātras of any type, *even* Pāda contains *three* caturmātras of any type followed by a long letter.

85. रासा—Four Pādas, each having 4+4+4+SS. This is different from the रासक mentioned at IV. 37-38 and also from the रास mentioned by Hemacandra at p. 36a, line 7. This metre is very frequently employed in the old Gujrati poems called 'Rāsas.'

86-88. A group of 2 Gāthas is called सन्दानित, a group of 3 is called विशेष; a group of 4 is called चक्कलक and that of 5 is called कुलक. Vv. 87-88 give the names of the groups of 6 to 14 Gāthās.

89. संपिण्डित गलिता—Four Pādas; each has 5+5+4+4+IS. The metre closely resembles रमणीयक (cf. IV. 26) and सौम्या (cf. III. 27). But what is the difference? Vv. 89-105 give the different varieties of गलिता, for which cf. Hemacandra, p. 30a, l. 11ff.

90. विशाला—The metre has only two Pādas, each having *eleven* Caturmātras of which the *even* ones are always of the नरेन्द्र (ISI) or of the विप्र (IIII) type; the rest should have 2 short letters in them i.e., the group of the SS type should not be used in the *uneven* places. प्रमुखद्विमात्राः in which two short letters are prominent.

91. विच्छित्ति—According to our author, this variety of गलितक has only two Pādas each having 2+4+4+4+4+4; of the five Caturmātras, none can be a नरपति (ISI). The Pādas of लम्बिता (cf. IV. 96) are also similarly formed, but there, a नरपति (ISI) regularly occurs in the 3rd and the 5th places. Hemacandra's विच्छित्ति (cf. p. 31 a, l. 16) consists of *four* Pādas which are unequal. In the odd Pādas, instead of the five *Caturmātras*, there occur five *Pañcamātras*; the even Pādas are formed like ours.

92. प्रसृता—This two, like विच्छित्ति, has two Pādas, each containing 5+5+4+ISI+4+ISI+4+ISS. Hemacandra's प्रसृता con-

sists of *four* such Pādas; nor does he prescribe any particular types of the Caturmātra and Pañcamātra groups as our author does; cf. p. 31a, l. 12. cf. अस्या एव प्रमुखे द्वे तिस्रः पञ्च चेति साकल्येन दश मात्रा भवन्ति । Com.

93. ललिता—This has four Pādas; each has 4+4+SIS+4 +SIS+S. The Pādas are rhymed as is shown by the stanza. Hemacandra (cf. p. 31a, l. 19) agrees but does not prescribe the सुवर्ण (SIS) Pañcamātra in particular, for the 3rd and 5th places. In the example given by the him, all types of the Pañcamātra occur.

94. विभूषणा—This has four Pādas; each having 2+ISI+SS+ ISI+S. Hemacandra, p. 31a, l. 2, agrees in point of the number of Mātrās, but not in point of the particular groups. In the text, I have supplied the words अंते विहूसणं in the 3rd line, but the commentary may suggest something else; cf. स्तनभारः सकर्णः नरेन्द्रः अतः प्रमुखे दत्तद्विमात्रः पादेन पादो यदि यमितः तां विजानीहि छन्दसि विभूषणां तां भूषणां जानीहि । In this, however, a *long* letter at the end is not mentioned and hence the change I made. In the *ms.* only the words पाउ अ जं ठिउ occur for the third line. According to the formulæ this cannot be right.

95. उद्गता—This is the same as the सामुद्गक (cf. IV. 56) metre; the only difference between the two is that in उद्गता there is rhyme at the beginning while in the other the rhyme is at the end. cf. यमकैः पौरस्त्यकृतैः । सामुद्गकमेव उद्गता । उद्गतायाः पुरःस्थिता यमकरचनेति विशेषः। सामुद्गकस्यान्ते पहिं विलग्गपहिं इत्यादिना यमको दर्शितः —Com.

96. लम्बिता—Four Pādas; each has 2+4+ISI+4+ISI+4. Compare notes on v. 91 above. Hemacandra, p. 31a, l. 15ff., agrees with our author in all respects. पाअएहिं-प्राकृतैः i.e., used in the Prakrit language.

97. शुभा—Four Pādas; each has 2+4+ISI+4+ISI+2 (i.e. S). This slightly differs from the last one. From the last line of the stanza, the name of this variety would seem to be शशिनिभा; but at the end of the stanza, the word सुहा occurs in the *ms.* Now it is the invariable practice of the scribe of our *ms.* to write down at the

end the name of the metre which is defined in the stanza. But if this name is retained, the last part of the 4th line becomes unintelligible. Our ms. does not contain the commentary on this and the following stanzas of this chapter. Hemacandra's शुभा (p. 30b, line 3ff.) agrees with ours; but according to him the नरेन्द्र groups in the 3rd and 5th places are not compulsory.

100-101. मुखगलिता—This is the same as the खण्डद्रुता (cf. IV. 47). It is of four kinds, according as (the even) Pādas contain 5, 7, 9 or 11, Caturmātrās each. The Pādas of the मुखगलिता of Hemacandra, p. 30b, line 8 ff. have respectively 7, 25, 7 and 25 Mātrās.

102-103. पद्गलिता—This has four Pādas; each has 4+4+5. The ms. reads पाअपसु जीसे in which case प must be treated as a short letter. I do not understand line 4 of v. 102 and the whole of v. 103. In the second half of v. 103 it is also possible to read अद्धमजमअ-निबद्धा i. e. अर्धमयमकनिबद्धा; unfortunately there is no commentary on these verses.

104. विषमगलिता—Four Pādas; the *uneven* Pāda has 4+ISI+4+S, the *even* Pāda has 4+4+ISS+S. I am not sure about the last line. I have given the formula of the *even* Pāda from the second line. Hemacandra's (cf. p. 31b, line 1) विषमगलिता is a mixture of विच्छित्ति and ललिता.

105. मालागलित--This seems to have only two lines each having 4+5+4+4+5+4+4+IS. The text of the second line is not clear. Hemacandra (p. 30 b, l. 11, p. 31a, l. 4) gives two मालागलितs. Both have four Pādas.

104. In all the metres so far discussed, a विप्र Caturmātra might occur where a नरेन्द्र is prescribed.

108. Different writers give different names to the metres as different names are given to children by the father and the mother. छिलिम्म=a child. It is a देशी word.

SOME PARALLELISMS IN INDO-ARYAN AND DRAVIDIAN WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO MARĀṬHĪ, GUJARĀTĪ AND KANARESE.

By

Alfred Master, I.C.S.

Chapter I.

Introduction.

§ 1.

The great antiquity of Sanskrit as compared with Dravidian literature renders a comparative study of Sanskritic and Dravidian forms somewhat unproductive of conclusions. The earliest Vedas date from about 1200 B.C. and the earliest Dravidian records from about 500 A.D. The Dravidian languages, especially Kanarese, have adopted so many Indo-Aryan words that it is impossible to say whether any word which is comparatively common in both Sanskrit or Prakrit and a Dravidian language is really Dravidian or even non-Aryan. Caldwell, in fact, gives more words as of common Sanskrit and Dravidian origin than words borrowed by Sanskrit from Dravidian.[1] There are words, moreover, found in Indo-Aryan, which appear to be of Munda or Indonesian origin, but here we are on still more difficult ground, as these languages have no literature and therefore no history. There are only fragmentary records of the spoken idiom of the three languages upon which this article is based and without a complete vocabulary no useful discussion of word origins is possible. The formations of phrases, idioms and syntax, which pass imperceptibly from the spoken to the written language, can be readily identified in literature and it is generally acknowledged that there is a specific Indian idiom easily distinguishable from that of Aryan. No attempt will be made to state the period during which any particular idiom entered a vernacular; an idiom may have existed in the parent language or it may have been introduced and popularised by those who adopted the language

---

* In this article, the Canarese ಳ is represented by ḷ.

[1] Caldwell,[3] pp. 580, 567.

during its infancy or at a later stage. But that the idiom is Dravidian and not Indo-Aryan will be indicated by the fact that there are other and as natural methods of expressing the same meaning in the Indo-Aryan vernacular, while the alternatives in the Dravidian vernacular are obviously awkward, unnatural and makeshift. In some cases, however, there must be doubt; for the Dravidian vernacular has been greatly influenced by the Indo-Aryan form of speech and has adopted Indo-Aryan habits, which the Indo-Aryan vernaculars have virtually discarded. And therefore some forms, which now seem to be *prima facie* essentially Dravidian, may in reality have been borrowed from Indo-Aryan and kept alive in the Dravidian vernacular alone by the force of the Sanskrit tradition. Such forms can be sifted only by reference to the spoken language and to the usage of the oldest written forms. I have deliberately based my enquiry upon Marathi, Gujarati and Kanarese, as these are the only Indian languages of which I have any first-hand knowledge.

§2. Political Geography.

2. The areas now known as Gujarāt, the Deccan or Mahārāṣṭra, and Kannaḍa have had very different histories. Gujarāt was included in a viceroyalty of Aśoka as far as the Tapti in the third century B.C. It was part of the Gupta empire in the fourth century A.D., under the Gujarāt 100-600 A.D. and again in the seventh century A.D. included in Harṣa's empire; and even when he was expelled by Pulikeśin in 620 A.D. remained in his possession so far south as the Narbada. Later it formed part of the Delhi Sultanate and subsequently of the Mughal empire.

3. The Marāṭhā country, on the other hand, was not included in any of the northern empires except partially and temporarily. The Rāṣṭrikas of the Marāṭhā country, the Bhojakas of Berār and the Peṭenikas of the Aurangabad district of Hyderabad were not included in the regular provinces of Aśoka and as their names imply[2] were probably what the Mughals later called local chiefs

[2] These are all revenue terms—*rāṣṭra* is a revenue-producing area (see Arthaśāstra, passim); *bhojaka* is one who enjoys land revenue and *peṭenika* lord of a *peṭha* or revenue area, a word still in use in the Bombay Presidency, cf. Bhandarkar *Aśoka*, pp. 32, 33

or *Zamīndārs* (Hind. *bhumiya*) with independent administration. It is true that they were vassals (Bloch §24, p. 33) but the linguistic influence must have been very slight compared with that exercised upon the areas under the direct administration of Aśoka. The Āndhras controlled the area from 250 B.C. to the third century A.D. and the power of the Dravidians is shewn by Pliny's mention and by the claim of Khāravela, king of Kalinga to have marched into Magadha to have been very extensive. Khāravela indeed humbled the Rāṣṭrikas and Bhojakas (Cambridge History, p. 600) who are supposed to have been subjects of the Āndhras, but were, as in Aśoka's time, probably tributary only. The Sātavāhana or Śatakarni dynasty followed and may have been of Dravidian race but Hāla, a king of the dynasty, wrote an anthology in Prakrit and it is probable that Mahārāṣṭri was the administrative language and that its spread was encouraged by the dynasty. For three centuries history is a blank, then came the Cālukyas of Badāmi and then the Rāṣṭrakūṭa who ruled until the end of the tenth century.

4. There were continuous struggles between various dynasties, invasions, and the formations of kingdoms and provinces by the Muhammadans, and the Vijayānagar empire. By the time of the later Muhammadan kingdoms the Marathi language was already formed.

5. The Kanarese area (Kannaḍa) was almost continually under the influence of the Southern rulers. Only during the Marāṭhā empire did it come under the sway of Marathi speakers and the influence of Marathi has since then been great. And it is in comparatively recent times that the official language has been made Kanarese; Marathi is still the home language of the Brahmans and the occasional Marāṭhā colonies.

6. An ancient Tamil tradition[3] refers to *pañca-draviḍam* or five Dravidian regions, comprising the Tamil, Telugu, and Kanarese countries, Mahārāṣṭra and Gujarāt. This probably refers to the time of the Āndhra domination, but the division is clearly linguistic and appears to denote those languages in which the

[3] Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: cf. *Cambridge History of India*, I. 593.

Dravidian element predominated as compared with the Gauḍas in which the Aryan element was the stronger. Marathi and Gujarati are now, of course, definitely Indo-Aryan, but Marathi is classed by Sir George Grierson as an Outer language and Gujarati as an Inner language with many of the characteristics of the Outer Band. The classification of Gujarati as a Dravidian Prakrit appears then to refer to a time, when the wave of invasion from the Inner languages had not yet affected the area. The use of the term Gurjara for the language spoken in the area (which is only approximately known), seems to indicate that the Gūjars were responsible for the change in the manner of development of the language of Gujarāt and that at the time of classification the Gūjars had established themselves, but not long enough to affect the language materially (*vide* also Turner Guj. Phon. §4). It is unsafe to argue from the Prakrit inscriptions of Aśoka that some form of Prakrit was generally spoken in the regions in which those inscriptions were erected although it has been asserted that they prove not only the language, but the literacy of the people of the region. Every milestone in India cries out against this argument, every Arabic inscription in a mosque, every Persian inscription over a gateway, every Sanskrit inscription in a step-well, every English notice in a remote village. All that such inscriptions prove is that the person erecting the inscription was ordered to do so and that he probably himself knew how to read it. There is nothing improbable in Aśoka having a rock edict engraved in a language which no one understood but officials or even, in remote parts, only the engraver. Similarly the Behistun inscriptions do not appear to have been engraved as a convenient means of publication, but as a permanent record of extent of power. The Girnār inscriptions of Aśoka do not then prove that anything resembling the Prakrit in which they are written was spoken in Gujarāt. Still less do they prove the contrary and it must be observed that Gujarati still maintains certain peculiarities of the Girnār dialect. It is however interesting to note that Prof. Turner suggests that the ancestor of Marathi was further to the North in Aśoka's time and that it was pushed South by the speakers of the ancestor of Gujarati. This suggestion would not, of course, exclude the implication I have made above, that the

languages spoken at the time in the areas now known as Gujarāt and Mahārāṣṭra were far closer akin than they are now.

7. But much later there was a close connection between Gujarāt, Mahārāṣṭra and the Kanarese country. The *Cālukyas* of *Badāmi* are in name the same as the *Solankīs* of Gujarāt. The *Rāṣṭrakūtas* ruled Gujarāt as well as the Southern country. A copperplate of *Kheṭaka* (Kaira), dated A.D. 826 (*Śaka* 738), gives a charter to a *Tailangi* Brāhman from *Badāmī* and mentions *Āmoghavarṣa*,[4] the author or patron of the *Kavirājamārgga*, our earliest Kanarese work, as a prominent member of his family (B.R.A.S. vol. xx. p. 131). The *Kannaḍa* poet *Ranna*, born A.D. 949 at *Muduvolal*, now *Mudhol*, was patronized by both a *Cālukya* and a *Rāṣṭrakūta* king (I.A. XL, p. 41). This is now a Marathi speaking tract and indeed *Āmoghavarṣa* states that *Kannaḍa* (Kanarese), was spoken from the *Kāveri* as far as the *Godāvari* (Pathak id. p. 12). Coupled with what has been said above, it appears that so late as the ninth century A.D. Kanarese was spoken over a large part of the present Maratha country[5] and apart from the statements of the later Prakrit authors about the dialects of *Dākṣiṇātyā* and *Vaidarbhikā*[6], the works of *Hālā*, who may be provisionally dated as of the 5th century[7] A.D. and the references in the Mṛcchakaṭika, which has been tentatively attributed to the 6th century A.D.[8], there is a probability that the centre of *Mahārāṣṭri* was more to the east of the present Marathi speaking area and that the *Mahārāṣṭri* language was not at any rate the principal language in the present Marathi speaking area. The reference in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is particularly interesting. *Candanaka*, the Southern tanner, who has learnt Sanskrit refers to the number of dialects he knows[9] and

[4] He also wrote in Sanskrit (Pathak, *Kavirājamārgga* intro. p. 9).

[5] There are numerous Kanarese inscriptions found in Kolhapur and Sholapur, now purely Maratha country (Pathak id. pp. 12-13).

[6] L.S.I. Marathi, p. 15.

[7] Cf. Keith *Classical Sanskrit Lit.* p. 50.

[8] Macdonell *Skt. Lit.* p. 361.

[9] A. W. Ryder's *Trans.* p. 102. Candaraka does not admit that he was a tanner, and possibly was not, but it appears to have been a stock jibe against Southerners.

mentions the *Karnātas* and *Drāviḍas* among others. He is specifically a *Kannaḍa* man, because he speaks of stirring up a quarrel the way they do down in the Karnāṭak. He refers to the habit of the Southerners, mixing up 'he and she,' 'gentleman' or 'lady.' This is of course, a burlesque, but clearly hints at the Dravidian lack of grammatical genders and its epicene plurals. The scene of the play is laid at Ujjain. Probably the term Southerner (*dākṣiṇātya*) refers to all persons coming from the country South of Ujjain and the *dakṣiṇa* country must have stretched much further north than it does at present. A further indication is that the Southerners were not speakers of Aryan but Dravidian. The dialogue in fact bears a close resemblance to the dialogue between Fluellen and Pistol, although because of more exact knowledge no one attempts to classify their dialects. As *Pṛthvīdhara* says, both *Candanaka* and *Vīraka* speak *Āvanti*, because *Āvantī* was the language of Ujjain (*Ujjayinī* or *Avantī*)[10].

8. The term *Dakṣiṇāpatha*, the South country, is as old as the Vedas and referred to the country bounded by the Vindhyas on the North. The *Periplus* (1st cent. A.D.) seems to have included in *Dakhinabades* all the country from the *Barygaza* (Broach on the Narmada)[11] to the first markets of *Damirica* (*Drāvida* country).[12] Samudragupta (330 A.D.) includes in the term all the country from the Narmada to Cape Comorin. *Rājaśekhara* (900 A.D.) speaks of the *Revā* (the upper waters of the Narmada) as the dividing line between *Āryāvarta* and *Daksināpatha*. The eastern Cālukya Rājarāja I speaks of the *Daksināpatha* between *Setu* (Adam's Bridge) and the Narmada (A.D. 985) as conquered by the first *Viṣṇuvardhana* (ab. A.D. 610). The term for a time became interchangeable with *Mahārāṣṭra*, but there was always a tendency to restrict the latter name to the N.W. non-Tamil highlands. The non-Aryan border was therefore much further North in the first

---

10 Woolner, Intro. to Prakrit, p. 178.

11 Anglice—*Nerbudda*.

12 P. V. Kane, *B.R.A.S.* LXX p. 620. *Damirica* presumably= *Dāmaraha* of the *Mārkandeya Purāna* 58 Journ. Cama Oriental Inst. No.2, p. 45.

century of our era than it is now and was probably still further North in the preceding centuries.

§3. *Beames and Caldwell on the connection of Dravidian with Indo-Aryan languages.*

9. Beames's argument against the existence of any Dravidian influence upon modern I-A vernaculars is based upon the view that their deviations from the original Sanskrit can be attributed solely to natural growth or natural decay. The climate of India has been held responsible for careless utterance and omission of syllables. But this is a misinterpretation of the physical doctrine of inertia. A body will continue in motion at a uniform rate unless interfered with by some external force. Similarly a language will continue intact unless there is some external influence. Climate probably plays a very small part. The Tael of South Africa and the Spanish of South America are more archaic than the parent languages. The difference of civilisation and racial pride prevented any aggression by the indigenous races. Beames has pointed out that the formation of Prakrit from Sanskrit is similar to that of Italian from Latin. The correspondence is, however, not so close as Beames's expression conveys. If we take the few words following from the first *terza rima* of the Divina Commedia, we find great differences in treatment between Italian and Prakrit—*mezzo, cammin diritta, smaritta* and *commedia* itself. Only one of these words *diritta* is similar to a Prakrit formation.[13] It is, moreover, inadvisable to assume that *diritta* is a natural I-E development of *directam*, for we have the French *droit*, which does not appear to have developed by exactly the same stage. It is possible, however, to say that the Italian and French forms shew how the Indo-European phonemas will react under influence and, if we find a similar reaction in Prakrit, we can attribute it to its Indo-European parentage. Even this limited conclusion may have its value. Thus we may compare the vocalisation of inter vocalic consonants and their final disappearance with the French development, *e.g.*, *mudez* from *mutatus*, *perdude* from *perditam*, in the first stanza

[13] *Diritta* from *directam* compared with *mezzo* from *medium*, *cammin(o)* from *caminum*, etc.

of the 'Vie de Saint Alexis' a poem of the early part of the eleventh century (edition Gaston Paris, 1903). Both the doubling of consonants and the vocalisation of intervocalic occlusives are Dravidian characteristics also, but the final disappearance of the latter is not. And to obtain an exact estimate of the Prakrit changes it would be necessary to ascertain exactly what influences produced the changes in Italian and French and I have not yet discovered any information on the subject. Beames has, however, not proved his case.

10. Caldwell (p. 60) considers that the modern Indo-Aryan languages have been affected by an external influence and that this influence is Turanian (or in his words Scythian). He considers Dravidian to be a Turanian language, a view not now generally held. He gives as his reason the following points common to Turanian and Indian languages:

(1) Inflexion by postpositions.
(2) Similar inflexion of singular and plural nouns.
(3) Use of inclusive and exclusive forms of 'we'.
(4) Formation of tenses from participles.
(5) Position of relative before principal sentence.
(6) Position of the governing word after the word governed.

But he does not find in modern I-A, the following special Dravidian characteristics:

(1) The relative participle.
(2) The regularly inflicted negative verb.
(3) Any of the Dravidian pronouns or numerals.
(4) Any primary roots such as head, foot, eye.

All these features are found in one I-A language, at least.[14] It is not, however, essential that the influence of one language upon another should entail adoption of all the special characteristics of the aggressor.

11. There is no particular reason, why Turanian should have had any, but the most ephemeral influence upon Indo-Aryan.

[14] *e.g.* The relative participle in Oḍiya; the negative verbs *nalage naye* in Marathi; the use of four Telugu numerals in the Marathi and Gujarati *gili-daṇḍa* and *iti-daṇḍa*; roots such as *nīro*, coconut milk in Gujarati, cf. Dravidian *nīru* water.

Turks and other Turanian speakers invaded India from time to time, but long after the Aryans were established and with little permanent effect, although they established temporary kingdoms. And Indo-Aryan has followed the Dravidian practice of inflexion of nouns by postfixed particles, not the Eastern *Tūrkī* practice of inflexion by nominal postpositions, although these types are to be found. Eastern *Tūrkī*, which I have taken to be the representative of Turanian, forms, for example, its genitive by adding *ning*—meaning originally property—as *āt-ning*, of the horse, *sarv-ning*, of a cypress.[15] The Indo-Aryan and Dravidian genitives are both inflexional. The Turanians moreover were more influenced by the civilisation of the Aryans than influencing it[16] and there was no reason why Aryan should adopt any of their linguistic[17] idioms. Those who invaded India were in a short time completely merged in the invaded nation in respect of religion, race and language. The Dravidian, on the other hand, were in an entirely different position. Anthropologists tell us that the majority of Indians conform to one type, which is represented in its purest form by the Southern Indian and which in the North is mingled with other races. The type called by them Dravidian, speaks Dravidian, when purest. They are a hard race to absorb. They have by no means been assimilated to the Aryan even in religion. Their Hinduism still retains many Dravidian features, their race is still easily distinguishable and the Dravidian languages are still vigorous. Dravidian social customs such as totemism still survive.[19] There are therefore no grounds to prefer a theory of independent Turanian influence to one of Dravidian influence.

§4. *The dialect which is most likely to have influenced Marathi and Gujarati.*

12. It is natural that the dialects of the Dravidian that most influenced the Aryan dialects should be the northern Kanarese

---

[15] *Mabānī'l-lughat* E. Dennison Ross *Bib. Ind.* pp. 78, 120.

[16] The *Śakas* in particular were for centuries under Iranian and Indo-Aryan influence. ([17]) *cf. Cambridge History of India*, p. 44.

[18] Whitehead—*Village gods of South India*, pp. 16, 17.

[19] Census of India 1901. *Ethnographic Appendices*, pp. 100, 162, and passim. Attempts have been made to show that the Marathi *devaks* are not totemistic, but not with success. At least they are not Scythian.

and Telugu rather than the southern dialects as Tamil. Both Kanarese and Telugu are known as *Vaḍaga* or *Baḍaga*, the northern languages, by the Tamilians and the *Baḍaga* dialect found in the Nilgiris is to-day the most archaic form of Kanarese. Kanarese appears to be the *Baḍaga* par excellence. Telugu should then be the southern language. The theory has been advanced that Telugu means "south"[20] and we find, Kan. *teṅka*, *teṅkalu*, *teṅkaṇa*, Mysore, Kan. and Ta., *teṛku*, Mal, *tekku*, meaning south, while "*Telugu*" is also found in the forms *telungu*, *tenungu*, *tenugu*. The phonetic laws of Drav. do not hinder the identification.

13. So far as the distribution to-day is concerned, Telugu extends further north (L.S.I. Munda etc., map opposite to p. 277). But north of the Telugu area are the speakers of *Goṇḍī* and Telugu is the southern language compared with *Goṇḍī*, while Kanarese is the northernmost dialect in the west. The Kavirājamārgga[21] (cir. A. D. 850) divides Kanarese into the Uttaramārgga and Dakṣiṇamārgga and characterizes the southern style as possessed of ten excellencies, which the northern type does not possess, e.g., virility, ease, clearness, sweetness and popularity. The author appears to have taken his cue from *Daṇḍin's* description of *Vaidarbhī* and *Gauḍī* in the *Kāvyādarśa*, where it is said that the *Vaidarbhī rīti* of Sanskrit is clear and ingenious while the *Gauḍī rīti* is full of hard letters and long compounds. This northern Kanarese was presumably spoken near the Godāvarī and was corrupted by Indo-Aryan influence.[22] But the influence would be mutual and it is probable that the substratum of Marathi and Gujarati is the Kanarese rather than the Telugu or even Goṇḍī type, although it will be seen later (para 39) that the numbers used in a children's game in Gujarāt and Mahārāṣṭra are in Telugu form. And although I have proceeded on the assumption that Kanarese is the dialect chiefly concerned, I have done so largely because I am in close touch with Kanarese speakers and not from a conviction that Telugu can be entirely neglected. In fact every dialect has preserved

---

[20] By Dr. Barnett—See *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I p. 598.

[21] II. 51, foll.

[22] I owe the above account to Mr. V. B. Joshi of Dharwar.

some old forms, which other dialects have lost and it is just these old forms, which are the most interesting relic of Dravidian in the Indo-Aryan languages. In the ensuing sections particular features of the Dravidian influence and Dravidian affinities will be discussed.

General Affinities.

14. Sir George Grierson (L.S.I. Dravidian p. 280) refers to the Indo-European principle of using a varied system of verbal tenses still found in the Vedas. In the old epics the forms are greatly reduced and in classical Sanskrit almost every verbal tense was replaced by a participle. In the modern vernacular there are only traces of the old tenses and new ones have been formed from the old participles as in the case in Dravidian forms. Max Müller in his Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners[23] gave, as the chief characteristics of classical Sanskrit style, the predominance of co-ordination, the use of the locative absolute, a fondness for long compounds and indeclinable participles supplying the place of subordinate clauses, the frequent employment of the past participle instead of the finite verb, a predilection for passive forms and the absence of the indirect construction and the subjunctive mood. He considers that as the great bulk of Sanskrit literature consists of poetry, Sanskrit style is naturally crude as compared with that of Latin and Greek. But there are no signs that Latin and Greek as we have them would naturally develop from the Sanskrit style. Homer does not contain these Sanskrit characteristics. But most if not all of them are Dravidian and are essential part of the structure of Dravidian languages. The fondness for long compounds is to-day a characteristic of spoken Kanarese. Ziegler (p. 74) gives us a translation of "Our people cannot do so much" as *Nammantha varinda aṣṭu kelasa māḍalikkāguvadilla*" (I omit his division of words as they are not given in the Kanarese from which the translation is made). The locative absolute, however, is not found in Dravidian although it possesses an absolute past participle and the infinitive is also used in the absolute sense. The fact that many of the commoner Kanarese verbs have past participles ending in *i*, a primitive locative suffix, may be significant; but *i* is

[23] Macdonell's *edition* 1886 § 220.

only one of the several vowels used to complete the verbal theme. The predilection for passive forms is non-Dravidian, but if it be considered as arising from a tendency to use one form for both active and passive verbs,—a tendency specifically Dravidian—no further explanation will be needed.

Chapter II

COMPARISON OF WORDS.

§6. *Vocabulary.*

15. It has never been disputed that Sanskrit may contain a number of Dravidian words, but Barnes's warning (Comp. Gram. Vol. I. p. 11) that Sanskrit cannot be derived from Tamil forms without suspicion is as timely as Sir George Grierson's reminder (L. S. I. Munda and Dravidian p. 278) that it is not sufficient to shew that a word is formed in Sanskrit or even in the Vedic dialects, in order to prove that it belonged to the original language of the Aryans and that modern philology has not traced many of the forms found in Sanskrit to other European languages. I do not propose to dwell on the question in view of the lack of elaborated material. As indicated in §1 Sanskrit is so very much older as a written language than Tamil, the most archaic of the Dravidian languages, that any forms adopted by it from Dravidian have been so completely absorbed that it is often impossible to tell whether they have been adopted from Dravidian or whether Dravidian has borrowed them from Sanskrit. If the forms are definitely proved to be non-Aryan, they may have been borrowed from any other language with which Sanskrit had contact. The fact that a particular word is the only word of its kind in a Dravidian language is not conclusive.

There is a distinct tendency in Kanarese for Aryan words to displace Dravidian (or *Accha Kannaḍa*) words, even those in commonest use. The popular words for night, month, sun, moon, day are *rātri*, *māsa*, *sūrya*, *candra*, *divasa* not only Sanskrit words, but *tatsamas*. There are true Kanarese words for all these ideas, but they are not commonly used. However, these adoptions appear to be confined to particular classes of words. In the cases quoted the words all belong to the class of measures of time and terms

appertaining to the Calendar which are notoriously international. Consequently we need not be quite at a loss in considering the attribution of origins.

§ 7. *Sanskrit.*

16. The earliest appearance of a Dravidian word in Sanskrit literature is probably in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*[24]. *Maṭacī* means "a locust" from a Dravidian word corresponding to the Kanarese *miḍice* a hopper or locust. The Kanarese verb *miḍi* means to hop, so there can be no doubt about the identity. The same root is found in Telugu[25]. *Daṇḍa* staff is found in the Vedas[26]. The Dravidian word *taṇḍu* means a stalk, and is the form now found in Tamil; *daṇṭu* and *daṇḍu* being other dialectical forms. The meaning stalk is found in any Indo-Aryan derivatives[27] and the connection with the Greek *dendron*, tree, suggested by *Wackernagel*[28] is remote in meaning and does not appear to be supported by phonetic laws[29].

17. In classical Sanskrit Caldwell in his comparative grammar and Kittel in his Kanarese Dictionary have identified a number of words as of Dravidian or as of common Sanskrit and Dravidian origin. One of the most interesting of these is *ghoṭaka* > *ghoḍā* Mar., which recalls *caballum* (*caballus*) > *cheval*. Kanarese *Kudure*: Tamil *Kudirei*: Telugu *gurramu*, is obviously connected with *ghoṭaka*. Like *caballus*, *ghoṭaka* is not found in the early classical language. It appears to be of popular origin. It is not found in the Arthaśāstra

---

[24] I. 10, 1. v. K. B. Pathak in I.A. XLII 235.

[25] Kittels' *Kanarese—English Dictionary.*

[26] Macdonell and Keith—*Vedic Index.*

[27] Beames *Comp. Gram*: s. v.

[28] I. 147.

[29] Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p. 33 n. 14. Prof. Turner has communicated to me the following note "**dandra* > *daṇḍa* is supported by **andrī* (I.-E. cf. Russ. *jadro* and in I.-A. Kalasha *ondrak*) > R.V. āṇḍàm, *candrà* (cf. Sindhi *caṇḍro* passionate) > class. Sk. *caṇḍa*. Probably **dandra* itself survives in Khowar *dron*, bowstave." Dr. Bloch mentions *droṇam* R.V. as connected by Uhlenbech with *dāru* (Gk. doru) in a note on K. *doṇi* boat, Pali, *doṇi*, Sgh. *doṇa*. The meanings staff, stalk, boat refer to objects, which are found in every country and the names for them are not likely to have been borrowed. The similarity of *daṇḍu* and *doṇi* with *dendron* and *droṇa* is not strong enough to dispose of the possibility that *daṇḍu* and *doṇi* are Dravidian in origin.

of Kauṭilya, which devotes the larger part of a chapter to horses. It is probably a back-formation from a Dravidian prototype which is lost.

§ 7a. *Middle Indian.*

18. In the Prakrit grammars forms similar to parallel Dravidian forms are constantly met. The case termination given by Vararuci (VI A.D.)[30] bear resemblances to Dravidian case terminations, which cannot be merely accidental. Vararuci gives *-ssa* and *-ṇo* as the Genitive masculine singular and *iṇaṁ*, *iṇa* as the genitive masculine plural. Kanarese for both numbers has *ina*, *-da*, and Tamil *iṉ*,*-uḍeiya*. Vararuci's Instrumental masculine plural *-hiṁ*,*-hi* suggests Kanarese *-i*, *-iṁ*, but Tamil has *-āl*. Vararuci's Ablative masculine plural *-hiṁto*, *-suṁto* appear to be formed from Instrumental *-hiṁ* and Locative *-suṁ* by the addition of *-to* (or *-do*, if the termination is the same as that of the Abl. masculine singular). The Kanarese Ablative is *-inda*, *-indam* formed apparently from Instrumental *-iṁ* and the termination *-da*, not Ablative here, but Genitive. The Instr. *-i* is also used as Ablative. The exchange of uses of the Instr. and Ablative is distinctly an I.-E. feature, but Kanarese like Latin uses one form *-i* (in Latin the Ablative) for Instr., Abl. and Loc. in addition to a special Loc. form, while Prakrit does not. In Vararuci the unvoiced dental has been used with the unvoiced nasal *m*, while in Kanarese the labial *ṁ*, which is better written *m*, has been assimilated to the class of dentals as *n*. Tamil has its Ablative *-oḍu* and its other forms (except the Genitive mentioned above) have developed differently from Kanarese. The forms both of Vararuci and of Kanarese are explainable without reference to each other. It is perhaps more probable that Kanarese has been influenced by I.-A. than the reverse, as Tamil shows hardly any resemblance to Vararuci's forms. If Kanarese was influenced by I.-A. it could not have been by Marathi which has a different set of endings, but must have been by Mahārāṣṭrī. And as one spoken language does not influence another in this way, even when supplanting it, it follows that the influence emanated from Mahārāṣṭrī literature. This conclusion

---

[30] Cowell Var. V 5-9.

suggests the idea that the scanty records of written Kanarese are due to an absence of Kanarese literature and that previously to 500 A.D. the literate Dravidians used Mahārāṣṭrī as their written medium. The patriotic movement, which produced Kanarese literature must, therefore, have been initiated by writers of Mahārāṣṭrī in the Kanarese country and spread later to the Tamil speakers, the indigenous literature of whom is, as is known, later than that of Kanarese. The subsequent abandonment of the Mahārāṣṭrī language as the common vehicle of expression by Dravidian speakers, would lessen its importance and drive it, so to speak, within itself, so that in the place of being the vernacular par excellence, it has now become only one of many. The absence of Mahārāṣṭrī forms in Tamil can be explained by the later date of the patriotic movement among the Tamil speakers, and their independence of the help of Sanskrit speakers. It is only when an indigenous literature upon the model of an alien language is proved possible that it is sought to make it entirely independent of its model.

19. Vararuci also gives (IV. 25) suffixes signifying possession *-ālu -illa, -ulla, -vanta, -inta*. These may be compared with Kanarese *-āḷi, -ila, -uḷḷa, -vanta, -iti.* (Kittel's Grammar p. 204-205). Kanarese may have adopted or adapted any or all of these expressions from Prakrit. On the other hand, it is not impossible to show that some are indigenous. For instance, *-uḷḷa* is the present relative participle of *-uḷ* to be and means in combination " one, who has. "[31] So *dhanamuḷḷam* = " a man with wealth " (old Kanarese); *oduḷḷam*=" a studying man (old Kanarese). The reverse is *illada* " not being " as *ōdīlladam* a not-student. The endings *-vala, -vaḷḷa, -vāḍa, -vaḍi, -vaḷa* are also found. It is probable that, as may have happened in many other cases, that forms of different origins have grown into similarity with each other, there being a tendency to discard dissimilar forms.

20. There are several words in Vararuci which resemble the Kanarese words *Āṇāla*, elephant's post, a variant for Sanskrit *ālāna*; *āṇe* is elephant in Kanarese although there is no

[31] Kittel's *Grammar* p. 244.

word *āṇāle*[32]. Māindo or māando, a mango-tree (IV. 33); the class. Sanskrit mākanda is called a deśi word in the form of Māyando by Hem. Des. (p. 228-9)[33].

In Kanarese we find *mā*, *māvu*; Tamil *māndi*; Telugu *māmidi*. *Māgāyi* or *māṅgāy* in Kanarese is an unripe mango. The forms *māṁ*, *mām*, and *mān* are also found[34]. The Sanskrit *mākanda* and *āmra*[35] can hardly be connected, but all the Dravidian forms centre round one root. Even *māgāyi* is from *ma*=mango and *kāyi*=unripe fruit; and the fact that the mango is essentially a tree of India makes it probable that the word itself is Dravidian. *Garta* (III. 25)=hole is Prakrit *gaḍḍo*, Kanarese *gadde* a rice square, *garta* in Sanskrit copper-plates, appears to mean a ditch or canal[36], and a rice-field is but an excavation to contain water. *Saṇham*, small, is derived from ślakṣṇa (III. 33) but in view of the more regular alternative **hlaṇha* or *laṇha* and the Kanarese *saṇṇa*, *cinna*; Telugu, *sanna*; Tamil, *canna sinna*, all meaning small, and Kanarese *sanna* low, which are intimately connected and universal in Dravidian, it is doubtful whether the derivation can be accepted.

21. Śabara (V cent. A.D.) in his Bhāṣya[37], mentions *pika*[38] cuckoo, *nema*[39] a tree, *sata* (not traced) and *tamarasa*[40] lotus—as derived from the language of non-Aryans.

---

[32] but cf. -āle in *suttāle*, a surrounding wall, in which *sutta* means "surrounding."

[33] Ed. Pischel.

[34] Kittel; *Dictionary*. S.V. mā.

[35] Tamil māmaram= mango-tree; Gujarati āmbo, mango tree, not mango (kerī) *vide* Belsare.

[36] Old Kanarese forms are *gaḷde* (circa 800 A.D.) and *gardde* (1019 A.D.)—Kittel *Grammar* p. 15.

[37] P. V. Kane *B.B.R.A.S.* LXXIV p. 88.

[38] Kanarese *pika*; Marathi *pik* cuckoo; Kanarese *pikal* (akki); Madras bulbul; Telugu, *pikili*, *pigili*, hill-bulbul.

[39] Kanarese Telugu *nemmi*, *nemi*, *nehi*; Kanarese *nema* (Sanskrit *nemi*).

[40] Kanarese *tamare*. Telugu *tamarei*. Tamil *tammi*, with other variations in all dialects.

22. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa in his Tantravārtika[41] (end of VII A. D.) mentions five words of the *Draviḍa* family—*cor*, *atar*, *pāp*, *māl vair*[42]. He points out these words, which are used in the Vedas, ought to be understood in the sense they have in the *mleccha* languages and should not be arranged so as to show a connection with Sanskrit, especially because this procedure cannot be adopted in the case of words of Persian, barbarian, Greek or Roman origin etc. Herein he apparently follows the lead of Śabara who (see preceding para) classed certain presumably Dravidian words as of non-Aryan origin. That this warning was necessary is shown by the classification by other grammarians of Dravidian as a variety of Prakrit. The attempt to affiliate Dravidian to Sanskrit was probably due to the completion of the Hinduisation of certain Dravidian peoples, who felt a natural anxiety to free their language from the stigma of barbarism. Kanarese never freed itself from Sanskrit influence, both direct and through Prakrit, and although it went so far as to distinguish in its grammars Sanskrit, Prakrit and acchakannada (Pure Kanarese) words, it relied upon the use of Sanskrit word for the development of its literature. Tamil, on the other hand, attempted to make its literature independent of Sanskrit and used Dravidian archaisms in place of Sanskrit expressions. There are traditions of Tamil compositions older than the written works and indeed these are mentioned in Tamil classics. They have not, however, survived and may never have been committed to writing. The facts explain why it is so difficult to trace Dravidian words in Sanskrit. Some Dravidian words have been deliberately altered, so as to make them resemble Sanskrit forms and others have been replaced by Aryan synonyms. The words given by Kumārila are not now to be found in the Vedas.

§7 *b. Modern Indian.*

23. I now turn to inscriptions, which appear to mark, in the

---

[41] Taken from the redaction of the passage by Mr. Ayengar I.A. XLII p. 200.

[42] The absence of the final vowel was a feature of Southern Kanarese, which the author of the *Kavirājmārgga* II. 100 (date circa 850 A.D.) considers superior to the Northern style.

modern vernaculars, as in the more ancient languages, the stage preceding that of written compositions. Bloch (p. 279) quotes an inscription found at Srāvaṇa Belgola (circa 1118 A.D.)[43]

Śri Gaṅga rāje suttāle karaviyaleṁ

King Ganga had the encircling wall made.

Suttāle is a Kanarese word meaning "the wall surrounding a temple." The former portion of the word is the Kanarese root *sutta*, around, but the element *-ale* or *-āle* is unknown. It may have a connection with the verb-suffix *-alu*, used to denote the verbal noun infinitive as *māḍalu* (to make) with the intensive particle *-e*, and possibly the word has been influenced by the Sanskrit *ālaya*. A direct connection with *ālaya* would infringe the Kanarese grammatical rule that *deśī* words must not be admitted into composition with Sanskrit tatsamas, a rule laid down by Keśīrāja (XIII century A. D.)[44] The word must be of some antiquity as *-ale* is not of the tadbhavas cited by Keśīrāja and it is accordingly unlikely that the formation is one of a Kanarese word and a tadbhava which is permitted in Kanarese grammar.

24. The passages from the Mānasollāsa (śaka 1051) do not appear to contain any Kanarese words, unless in the second quotation given by Dr. Bloch *gīcī*, which is an alternative reading for *gopī*[45], is the Kanarese word *gicci* meaning "whirling round." Similarly the inscription of Pāṭaṇ near Cālisgāon (śaka 1128) does not appear to contain any definitely Kanarese words. I should like, however, to draw attention to *āiṁ* or *āuṁ* translated as tax, which corresponds to the Sanskrit word *āya*, revenue. The word *āya* is now both in the Mahārāṣṭra and Kanarese country used exclusively of the dues for village servants in kind. The root *āy* in Kanarese means 'to collect' and the *āya* is essentially a sum collected. Kanarese has a word *āykuḷi*[46] a collector of alms which is attested by Keśīrāja (XIII century A. D.). The word therefore cannot be a tatsama or is one of such a great

[43] Apte, *Marathi* p. 53 says Śaka 905.

[44] Kittel *Grammar*, p. 214.

[45] Apte, p. 56.

[46] *Kuli* is a nominal termination not to be confused with *Kuli*, hire of a labourer.

age that its origin has been forgotten. The Pandharpur inscription (Śaka 1195) needs fresh publication and is too doubtful to furnish any information.

25. We have now reached the period of the Jain Pandits Dhanapāla (X century A. D.)[17] who wrote the *Pāialacchi* of Prakrit words and Hemacandra (XII century), who wrote the *Deśi nāmamāla*. They were Gujaratis. The corresponding Marathi author is Jñāneśvara of the XIII century and the Kanarese authors are Nāgavarmma (XII century) and Keśirāja (XIII century A. D.). All these authors but Jñāneśvara were Jains who were anxious to preserve the purity of the languages in which they wrote. In each one of their writings are a number of words which there is good reason for considering not only Dravidian but Kanarese. Kumārilabhaṭṭa who counted Gujarat and Mahārāṣṭra as Dravidian countries, quotes in the 8th cent. A. D. words, which are Tamil in type, but the later writers favour the Kanarese dialect. I regret that at present, I can only give a few words from each author. The Gujarati words are necessarily of a common Gaudian type, as Gujarat is further removed from the Kanarese influence than the Maratha country.

26. It must be borne in mind that the Prakrit-writing authors, although they purport to give lists and explanations of *deśī* words only, often include tadbhavas, which appear such obvious derivations from Sanskrit that it is a matter of wonder, why they were included; undoubtedly some tadbhavas have been included, but some of these suspicious words may be in reality of Dravidian origin, although they have a Sanskrit equivalent.

27. *Gujarat.* Dhanapāla gives few words which are certainly Dravidian and most of those on his list appear to be tadbhavas. He translates *chippiraṁ*[18] by the Sanskrit *palālam*, straw. This corresponds to the Gujarati *chāpruṁ*, a thatch or thatched cottage; to Hemacandra's *capphalo*, a kind of peak or ridge; Marathi *chappar*, a hut made of leaves; or a frame of grass, Kanarese *cappara*, a thatched roof or shed (usually considered a tadbhava)

[17] The colophon in the Bhavnagari *edition* 1873 gives the Vikram era past year 1028 (A.D. 923) as the date of the work.

[18] Belsare *Guj. Dict.* S.V. chāparuṁ.

and *cappariga* (taken by Kittel to be Dravidian), a name given to several kinds of grass. Dhanapāla has like Hemacandra *pulli* meaning tiger, Old Kanarese *puli* (p. 68); but his work being a thesaurus of Prakrit (probably Saurasenī or Āvantī as his father was a native of Ujjain) does not purport to contain Deśī words.

28. Hemacandra on the other hand not only supplies a number of words which are at present the earliest forms traced of many Gujarati and Marathi words, but some of which are not only Dravidian but are found in old or modern Kanarese. A few of the most conspicuous are given.

Des :	I	6	*akka*[49] sister (*akka*, elder sister)[50].
„	I	61	*uḍḍo*, well digger (*vaḍḍa* a tribe working in stone),[51].
„	I	143	*ūro*, village (*ūru*)
„	III	21	*cikka*, trifling (*cikka*, small, trifling).
„	VII	38	*pāvo*, serpent (*pāvu*, old Kanarese).
„		79	*pulli*, tiger (*puli* old Kanarese).
„	VII	61	*viḷham*, white (*biḷe*).
„	VIII	29	*sindī*, date-tree (*sindi*).

29. Two words may be added—*airo* (I. 16) an official, corresponding to Kanarese *ayyaru*, a term of respect, the plural form of *ayya* or *ay*. Whether or not the word is a tadbhava of *Ārya*, which seems to have been rather freely fathered with derivatives, the Kanarese plural is unmistakable. *Ayyaru* is now used as a term of respect for school masters, like *mehto* in Gujarat and the meaning "official" is clearly cognate. *Āvu* (I-61) water, may be derived from the Sanskrit *ap* or *ambu*. It may also be the Kanarese *ā* or *āvu*, used by children in the sense of water or milk.

30. The forms *pāvo* and *pulli* instead of the modern *hāvu* and *huli* date them as prior to Keśirāja (XIII cent.) who is already recommending (Kittel Grammar, para 223) that initial p should

---

[49] Sanskrit akka, mother. Cf. use of Gujarati kāko, uncle for father, bhai for father and son; Marathi tai (Kanarese mother) for sister.

[50] The words in brackets are Kanarese and the meanings where omitted are the same as those given by Hemacandra.

[51] Earlier odra, a Śudra tribe (Manu, cf. Si-odra), as Prof. Turner informs me. The Gujarati word for the tribe is Od.

be changed into ḥ. This tallies with Hemacandra's date (XII A. D.).

31. *Maratha Country.*—In the *Jñāneśvarī* occur the following words which are also Kanarese. There were probably many others in existence in the language and only a few of those actually to be found in the Jñāneśvari have been quoted.

Jñāneśvari.	Kanarese		
aḍava	aḍvi	forest	cf. Sanskrit aṭavī
tūka	tūk	weight	
doṇī	dōṇi	boat	cf. Sanskrit droṇam.
beḷi	beli	fence	
bhāngāra	bangār	gold	
moḍa	mōḍ	cloud	

It may be noted here that although grammars emphasise the theory that all Kanarese words keep the final vowel in pronunciation, the popular pronunciation clips it. The inherent "a" has therefore been omitted above.

32. *Karnāṭak.*—Nāgavarmma in V. 55 of his Karnāṭaka Bhāṣābhūṣaṇa condemns the combination of Kannaḍa and Sanskrit words in composition, comparing it to the stringing together of pearls and black pepper,[52] the pearls apparently representing Sanskrit. The earlier Nṛpatuṅga compares the practice to the pouring of butter-milk into boiling milk and Nāyasena (early XII century A. D.) likens it to mixing ghi and oil. The earlier tradition is not so disdainful of Kanarese as Nāgavarmma, and makes it clear that even as early as the VIII cent. A. D. an effort was made to keep Sanskrit distinct from Kanarese. Unfortunately it cannot be definitely assumed that when a word is found in combination with an undoubted Kanarese word it must also be Kanarese, for although Kanarese grammarians do admit tadbhavas, they are inclined, like the Prakrit grammarians, to put tadbhavas and *deśī* words on the same footing.

33. Keśirāja divides Kanarese words into four classes—(1) *deśiya* or *accakannaḍa*, (2) *Samasaṃskṛta* or what are generally known as tatsamas, (3) *tadbhava*, (4) *tatsama* so-called.[53] These

[52] Kāvyālokanam *Bibl. Carn.* 1903, p. 47.

[53] Kittels' Grammar, p. 432.

Kanarese tatsamas are twenty-one in number and are supposed to be words common to Sanskrit and Kanarese. They include *aṅka* number, *koṭ* fort, *maṇi* jewel, *late* creeper.

Kittel believes that these words were borrowed by Sanskrit. Some may have been—*koṭṭu* in Kanarese means also a crest and Hemacandra gives *koṭṭa* as a *deśī* word equivalent to *nagar* (city). Others were certainly not. *Bandi*, a captive, must have been borrowed from Sanskrit[54] and indeed it would be the first word an invaded people would learn from the invader. The twenty-one tatsamas must therefore be separately analysed and the only useful indication which tradition can give us is that the borrowings are so ancient, as to have already been forgotten, when the study of Kanarese grammar began.

34. We have now arrived close to the period at which modern Gujarati and Marathi begin. I do not propose to collect examples of Dravidian words from the fragments belonging to the beginning of the literary periods. In modern Marathi many Dravidian words occur. Nor do I attempt here to repeat any of the long lists which have been given by A. K. Kher (Higher Marathi Grammar, p. 899) or others, and they contain many words demonstrably Indo-Aryan. Marathi has many words of relationship which are certainly Kanarese e.g., *appā*, (*āpā*), *akkā*, *aṇṇā* [55]. They are words of respect used in the home. *Tūp* (Kanarese *tuppa*, rendered butter), *pīl* and *pillum* (Kanarese *pille*, young of animal) and similar words are only of interest because there seems no reason why they should have been borrowed. It seems legitimate to presume that words used daily in the home are more likely to belong to the language originally spoken by the inhabitants than to have been borrowed through intercourse with neighbours.

35. In Gujarati it would seem *prima facie* impossible to have Kanarese words. But some undoubtedly exist. *Ūru*, village may exist in place names, as *Mangrol* or *Mangalūr* and other names ending in *-ol*. There is also *bhāgoḷ*—village entrance, gate

---

[54] It is a typical Aryan and Indo-European word; cf Persian, *banda*, a slave.

[55] Father, elder sister, elder brother.

(Kanarese *bāgalu*—door). Belsare's *Gujarati-English Dictionary* gives the form *bhāgaḷ* and the meaning, gate in the wall of a town, which I have never met, but accept. *Chīp*, a shell, is Kanarese *cippu*, a shell[56]; *boḍuṁ*, bald, is Kanarese *bōḷu*, *bōḍu* hairless, bare. All these Kanarese words are found in the other Dravidian languages and are all used in a more general sense than in Gujarati. Of these words *bhāgoḷ* alone does not appear in Marathi. *Bōḍu* is found in the forms *boḍ boḍka*, and *cippu*, *simpu* as *śimp*, *śimpā*, with the same meanings. Mr. N. B. Divatia (Gujarati Language Vol. I., p. 61.) mentions the use of the words *vakaṭ leṇ mūr nār*, in the game of *Gilīdaṇḍa*, which he identifies with the Kanarese numbers *vakkattu* (sic), *yarḍu*, *mūru*, *nālku*. They appear rather to be the Telugu words *okaṭi*, *reṇḍu*, *mūḍu*, *nālagu*[57], but probably are derived from the ancestor of Kanarese and Telugu. Belsare (Guj.-Eng. Dictionary) gives *vakaṭ-reṇḍ* as alternatives to *vakaṭ-leṇḍ* and *nāl* as the fourth of the seven blows in Gilīdaṇḍa instead of *nār*.

36. It is the object of this section merely to show that Kanarese cannot be neglected as a source of derivation of Indo-Aryan vernacular words, and I should like to emphasise again Sir George Grierson's opinion that it should not be too easily assumed because a Sanskrit word and a Prakrit or Modern Indian word are similar according to the rule of the Prakrit grammarians that the Sanskrit word is the original. In legal phraseology there is a difference between facts, which may not be presumed to be true and which are to be taken as conclusive proof. In cases where a Sanskrit word and an I.-A word exist in parallel forms, the presumption that the word is I.-A., should not be made. If there is no Dravidian word to correspond, the truth of the fact may be presumed, but the proof is not conclusive until an I.-E. correspondence has been adduced. If a similar Dravidian word exists, it should not be assumed to be a tadbhava. It is indeed likely that a re-examination of I.-A. words from this point of view may modify the phonological laws, as they exist at present.

---

[56] *i.e.* cocoanut shell. *Simpu*—oyster-shell (a doublet) corresponds with *chīp*.

[57] See Caldwell 3rd ed., pp. 322-335.

Chapter III

PHONOLOGY.

§ 8 *Cerebrals.*

37. It is not the purpose of this article to discuss phonology in detail. Dr. Bloch's "La Formation de la langue Marathe," Professor Turner's Gujarati Phonology[58] together with Dr. Kittel's Grammar of the Kannaḍa language, Caldwell's Comparative Philology and Mr. K. V. Subbaiya's articles[59] supply a wealth of material, which needs a separate study. In the following sections I will only refer to a few points of special relevance to my theme.

38. *Cerebrals.* Although cerebral letters form an essential feature in Dravidian phonology, Dr. Sten Konow (in L.S.I. Munda, p. 279), does not venture to assert that the Dravidian language introduced cerebrals to Indo-Aryan. He is content to state that "all that can be said is that Dravidian influence has given strength to a tendency which may have taken its origin among the Aryans themselves." There is, however, no particular reason why there should have arisen among the Aryans any tendency towards cerebrals. It is true that there are cerebral sounds in many Indo-European languages and possibly Iranian but they have never shewed any tendency to develop. Indo-Aryan has alone shewed such a tendency and this, in proportion to its proximity to Dravidian. The process may even be represented as a tendency of Aryan to resist the introduction of cerebrals from Dravidian, and by its influence to reduce the number of cerebrals in the Dravidian languages most affected by it. Tamil has more cerebrals than Kanarese. Old Kanarese had *ṟh*, *ṟ*, *ḻ* and two *ḷs*, *kṣaḷa* and *kuḷa* (Kittel Grammar pp. 7-10) in addition to the ordinary *r* and *l*. Marathi and Gujarati have only one *ḷ* and *ṛ* written as *ḍ*; but distinct in pronunciation from the latter letter. Panjabi and Hindustani have *ṛ* as well as *ḍ*, but Hindustani has no *ḷ* and the Panjabi *ḷ* has only been recognised at a comparatively late date[60].

[58] *J.R.A.S.* July and October 1921.

[59] Ind. Ant. 1909, 1910.

[60] Odiya also has cerebral ḷ (T. J. Maltby, Practical Handbook of the Uriya or Oḍiya Language, 1874, p. 2.)

Modern Kanarese has now fallen into line with Marathi and Gujarati and has only *ḷ* and *ḍ* to represent the vanished cerebrals.

39. In Vedic Sanskrit cerebrals are used sparingly and with uncertainty. Ḷ and ḷh are interchanged with ḍ and ḍh, just as ḻ was interchanged with ḍ in old Kanarese. The Kavirājamārgga II. 100 is the authority for this transposition in its statement that the northern Kanarese form *nōḍuven* is preferable to the southern Kanarese form *nōḻpen*. The latter word is undoubtedly the more archaic as it presents the root *nōḻ* with a consonantal termination and the unvoiced form of the ending *-pen*. Vedic *ḷ*, *ḷh* may possibly represent Dravidian ḷ, *ḻ*.

In Prakrit Hemacandra has *vilham* with the meaning of Kanarese *biḷe* white (v. para 28) and although *l* is found and not *ḻ* the confusion between *l*, *ḷ* and *ḻ* is attested by the Tamil *veḻḻa* and the Telugu *vella*, both of which mean white. The parallel is not weakened by the use in Kanarese of *ḍ* for *ḻ* instead of *ḍh*, for not only is Kanarese inimicable to the aspirated consonant, but it has a real use for its *ḷ*. Therefore if induced by Aryan influence to curtail its alphabet, it would adopt the unaspirated consonant as its substitute for the obsolescent *ḻ*.

40. The cerebral vowels *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ* and *ḹ* and the consonant *ṣ* are not found in the Dravidian languages or indeed in Marathi and Gujarati with insignificant exceptions[61]. This fact seems to contradict the supposition of the Dravidian origin of cerebrals, but it can be explained. Cerebral vowels indeed are not Dravidian, but Aryan. Sanskrit ṛ, the only really useful cerebral vowel, corresponds to Avestic *ere*. The other signs are due to a desire for symmetry. That is to say, the vowel scheme of the Sanskrit alphabet is as follows:—one group of vowels, which have no semi-vowels to correspond and are conventionally arranged in pairs of long and short, as being of somewhat similar quality—a, ā, ; e, ai ; o, au and another group, with semi-vowels to correspond and arranged in pairs of long and short of same quality y, i, ī ; r, ṛ, ṝ ; l, ḷ, ḹ ; v u, ū. This arrange-

[61] *Iṣṭu* and its congeners are isolated Dravidian forms in Kanarese and the group is otherwise found only in tatsamas, and in a few tadbhavas only

ment appears to have preceded the more exact analysis demanded by *sandhi*. The letter ṣ was necessitated by the admission of a cerebral *varga*, but was not needed for the distinction of words. The fact that Dravidian does not admit these sounds does not indicate anything more than that the Sanskrit alphabet was created after the contact of Aryan with Dravidian, a matter which is in itself probable. Why Dravidian should have influenced the Sanskrit alphabet only in the direction of cerebral consonants, it is impossible to say. It was at any rate the only positive contribution it could make. Marathi and Gujarati not only share with Kanarese (and Dravidian) the objection to the cerebral vowels and ṣ, but they also incline towards the Dravidian repugnance of sibilants and aspirates by simplifying their other sibilants. Gujarati is inclined to use one only of the sibilants s or ś, and the same tendency occurs in Marathi (*cf*. Bloch §15). This tendency exists also in other vernaculars, e.g., Panjābī has only one sibilant s. The failure to distinguish sibilants is either a general Aryan or indeed Indo-European characteristic or due to Dravidian influence. Iranian languages do distinguish their sibilants, but the probable derivation of the Aryan alphabets from Semitic sources suggests that the distinction was due to Semitic influence and is artificial in character.

§ 9. *Palatals.*

41. Dr. Bloch (§. 24 p. 33) describes two phonetic peculiarities, which distinguish Marāṭhi from the remainder of Indo-Aryan languages — one is the loss of the pure palatal character of the palatal semi-occlusives before the posterior vowels. This phenomenon is also found in Gujarati (L. S.I. Guj. p. 330; Divatia, Gujarati Language and Literature, I. p. 340 foll.), e. g. *Carotar* is pronounced *çarotar* with a bias towards *sarotar*. It is also found in Telugu (Bloch §24) and Kanarese (Ziegler, Pract. Key p. 2, first note), In the latter language *heccu* more and *muccu* to close, are pronounced *heççu* and *muççu*. I can personally vouch for this sound in Gujarati and Kanarese. Its origin is unknown. It is not found in Sanskrit and apparently does not exist in Tamil. I say apparently, because the very late recognition of its existence in Gujarati and Kanarese gives rise to a suspicion that it may exist

in other vernaculars[62]. It appears to be similar in character to the use in Gujarati of ś before the front vowels and s before the back vowels, e.g., śīpāhi (Persian sīpāhi), but sarai or sari (Persian sarāī) and pinsan for pinśan (English pension). It should be observed that in Marathi the usage is variable before *e*, i.e., ce or çe. je or je. The depalatalised j is, so far as I remember, found only when *e* is pronounced *a*, as in *pāija* for *pāhije*.

§ 10. *The Dipthongization of "e" and "o."*

42. This is the second of Dr. Bloch's "phonetic peculiarities." Initial *e* and *o* are pronounced *ye* and *wo* in all Dravidian languages (Bloch, §24). The pronunciation is found universally in Marathi but not in Gujarati. The word *Yeṇeṁ* (Marathi) to go, is always written so, and in fact, I would have stated a short time ago that the form *eneṁ* was definitely incorrect. The dipthongization of medial e and o is found not only in certain dialects of the Konkan (Bloch § 24) but in Kanarese, where it is more common than Kanarese speakers care to acknowledge and probably is universal in the Lingayat home. I have heard *gwott-illa* for *gott-illa*, I do not know, in Bijapur and Dharwar and *Byāḍar* and *Nyāmappa* are variants of *Beḍar* and *Nemappa* (both names) that I have heard in Dharwar district[63]. It is possible therefore that the two phenomena are not independent of each other as Dr. Bloch considers. The use of *ya* and *e* indifferently in Marathi *tya* and *te*, *cya* and *ce* (the oblique form) (L.S.I. Marathi, 22 and my own experience) is a further piece of evidence. The dipthongization of "e" and "o" seems certainly a specifically Dravidian characteristic. Professor Turner, however, in his review of Dr. Bloch's 'La formation de la langue Marathe' (Indo-Aryan 50, 99) points out that *e*, *o* > *ye*, *wo* also in Kumaoni and Nepali. This pronunciation apparently can be ascribed to other than Dravidian influence, but in the case of Marathi there seems no need to seek an alternative explanation.

---

[62] After writing the above I find that T. J. Maltby, Practical Handbook of the *Oḍiyā* language 1874, remarks (p. 2) that *ch* (=*c*) is softly pronounced like *ts* when not combined with *e*, *i* or ī and *j* is always pronounced *dz*, but when combined with *i* or ī like *j*. *Oḍiya* is the other important border language in touch with Telugu.

[63] Beḍa, it is not wanted, is often pronounced byāḍa (Zeiglor p. 29).

§11. *Other Sounds.*

43. There are many remarkable correspondences between middle Indian and Dravidian as regards phonology. Prakrit has all the Sanskrit vowels except *ṛ* etc., and the dipthongs *ai* and *au*; *e* and *o* are no longer diphthongs and may be short or long.[68] Dravidian has the same peculiarities. The modern alphabets possess *ei* and *au* but *ei* < *e* < primitive *a* and *au* are only used in the pronunciation of Sanskrit derivatives. Even Beames, who is averse from admitting Dravidian influences, admits the probability of non-Aryan influences in certain vowel changes from Sanskrit and in the case of *ai* particularises Dravidian and Kolarian (*Muṇḍārī*) sources (I. 168-169). Long *ā*, *ī*, and *ū* become severally *a*, *i* and *u*, before the consonants, but if the long vowel is retained one of the consonants is elided. Prakrit has no palatal or cerebral sibilant; initial *y* becomes *j*; *t* and *p* generally pass into *d* or *v* (or *b*); *ṭ* > *ḍ*, *ḍ* often>*l*[69]; *r* > *l*; *ś* and *ṣ* > *s*: conjunct consonants are transformed into a double consonant and sometimes a new vowel is inserted between the two consonants instead. (Cowell, Intro. xviii and xx). Dravidian possesses all these characteristics and treats its tadbhavas in the same way as Prakrit. Dr. Bloch has indicated (Ind. Ant: xlviii pp. 191-4 quoted Turner §11) that the Indo-Aryan languages, so far as concerned intervocalic consonants, went the same way as Dravidian, but in one respect the Dravidian practice is closer to the middle Indian than the modern Indian; that is in the use of doubled consonants.[70] The treatment of tadbhavas sometimes corresponds with the Prakrit practice and sometimes goes on lines, which Prakrit might have followed, but did not. So in Keśava's list of Tadbhavas (circ. A. D. 1250 Kittel, Grammar: p. 433 foll.) appear *tiṇ* > triṇa; *ār* < āhāra; and *āgāra* < ākāra. But there are also *akkara* < *akṣara* and *dāḷimba* > *dāḍima*, the latter being in contrast with Prakrit *ḍālima*.

---

[68] Cowell, *Intro.* p. xviii.

[69] But in Kanarese ḷ or ḻ.

[70] Tamil even doubles after a long vowel vākku, (*vāk*) without shortening the vowel or after a short vowel derived from a Sanskrit short vowel, appu (ap). (Caldwell p. 135.)

44. Other Prakrit features, which are more marked in modern Indian are the insertion of a fresh vowel as *harisa*, (*harṣa*)[71] like Kanarese *juguti* or *jukuti* (*yukti*)—Kittel, *ibid*—, spontaneous nasalisation and denasalisation (Bloch §§66-72) and the softening of intervocalic *m* into *v*. (Bloch §137 and Turner §67). The spontaneous nasalisation or denasalisation is found in Tamil and Kanarese (Caldwell p. 167-173), but the Tamil nasalisation appears to be more extensive and more systematic than that of Indo-Aryan. The spirantisation of intervocalic *m* is effected in Kanarese not only in the case of Tadbhavas—*dāvu* (*dhāma*), *ḍavaruga* (*damaruka*) etc., but doublets of the Dravidian words *tāmare* (*tāvare*, a lotus); *emage, evage, tamage, tavage*, Dative plurals of the personal pronouns, they and themselves, are found in the middle Kanarese. In old Kanarese, i.e., up to the middle of the 13th century, these forms are not found, but the *anusvāra* or *sonne* is used (as also in middle Kanarese) as a termination of the nominative plural of pronouns. It becomes *m* the labial, before vowels and alternatively *vu*, (Kittel p. 74-75). The Kanarese *sonne* does not, however, appear to have more than the form of the Sanskrit *anusvāra*. Kittel p. 7 definitely says that when final, it has the sound of English *m* in bottom.

45. The Kanarese *sonne* resembles the *Anunāsika*[72] rather than the *anusvāra* which is not a Kanarese sound. Tamil has not even admitted the sign of the *sonne* into its alphabet. In nominal and verbal endings the *sonne* in Kanarese becomes *m*, *n*, *v*, or *vu* in the singular and *m* or *n* in the plural generally in connection with a following vowel; and adverbs, postpositions and conjunctions ending in *sonne* when followed by a vowel change the *sonne* into *m*. (Kittel, Grammar p. 179, 180). There still exists an uncertainty in the use of *n* and *v*. Quite recently at a public auction I heard

---

[71] Cowel, Intro. p. xx.

[72] *i.e.*, the varga nasal see Max Muller, *Sanskrit Grammar*, para 11 "according to Sanskrit grammarians, the real *anusvāra* is *nāsikya*, the five nasals, anunāsika, nasalised, *i.e.*, pronounced by their own organ of speech and uttered through the nose—Pāṇini, Siddhānta Kaumudī, I. 1.9." Macdonell, *Sanskrit Grammar for Students*, 3 para 7 says, however, that some distinguish from anusvāra, anunāsika or the nasalised vowel—anusvāra being originally only used before the sibilant or h.

the name Revappa pronounced indifferently as Renappa and it was recorded in both ways in the government records.

According to Dr. Bloch in Marathi the old intervocalic *m* became spirant and ended in *v* nasal, the nasality of which was unstable enough to disappear in some cases. Pischel (§251) gives many examples of both *v* nasal and *v* as developments of *m* and some cases in which *m* has weakened into *anunāsika* (or *anusvāra*). Dr. Bloch therefore concludes that *m* became spirant in every position either after the epoch of Hemacandra (XII century A. D.) or earlier, but not so much before him as to prevent him losing the tradition of writing the intervocalic *m*, though the sound had disappeared (Bloch 137). If this view is correct, the fact is of some importance. The earliest instance of the change of *m* into *vu* given by Kittel (Grammar, p. 74) is from an inscription of 1123 A.D. and this shews that both grammarians of Prakrit and Kanarese had noticed the change. It may be assumed that the changes in each language were connected.

46. The evidence is not strong enough to assert a Dravidian origin, but the following points may be noticed. The Kanarese *anusvāra* is pronounced *m*, when final, and medially is the nasal of the *varga* of the succeeding consonant. It does not exist otherwise. *M* became *n* or *v*, but could never become *nv*, which is not a Kanarese sound.

The strongest argument in favour of the Dravidian origin of the movement is that the change although known to I.-E. is rare in Sanskrit and that when languages influence one another, phonetic changes are made by those who adopt words in their vocabulary or adopt a whole vocabulary, and are never due to indigenous speakers adopting the phonetic idioms of a language by which they are influenced. For instance, there are no Marathi or Kanarese words spoken with an English pronunciation except as part of the English language. And of the many Persian words which have found their way into modern Indian, very few have retained their original pronunciation. The above argument applies to all phonetic variations from the I.-E. type common to Indo-Aryan and Dravidian.

Chapter IV

SUBSTANTIVES.

§ 12 *Genders.*

47. Gender may be classified as natural or conventional. Dravidian has no conventional gender, *i.e.*, a gender entirely independent of the sex or sexlessness of the noun, it being understood that sex is an attribute of the rational being only. It is probably because the sun is divine that we find the Sanskrit tatsama treated as masculine, *suryanu*. Dr. Bloch (§180) states that with the exception of Singhalese no Indo-Aryan language besides Marathi and Gujarati has preserved all the genders, but apparently Singhalese has only animate and inanimate genders and cannot be considered to be an exception *eiusdem generis*. The Singhalese use appears to approximate to the Dravidian use. Kanarese like other Dravidian languages has masculine, feminine and neuter terminations, but the masculine and feminine forms are rigidly applied to words denoting or referring to men and women and the neuter to irrational objects. The gender terminations are of some antiquity, but appear to be less spontaneous and more artificial than the corresponding Marathi and Gujarathi terminations. They appear to be either pronominal affixes or actual pronouns and the masculine and feminine forms have been derived from words denoting "man" and "woman." Old poetic forms and colloquial forms frequently ignore these terminations and it is extremely probable that they were due to the inspiration of Sanskrit from which the Dravidian pandits derived their grammatical theories. Caldwell (p. 220) does not agree that the Dravidian development of gender is the result of direct Sanskritic influences "of which no trace is perceptible in this department of Dravidian grammar, but have arisen either from the progressive mental cultivation of the Dravidians themselves or from an inheritance of pre-Sanskritic elements." Caldwell based his conclusions on Tamil literature and my remarks are based on Kanarese literature

which Caldwell probably considered more recent. But the dates of Tamil literature are vague, while that of the earliest Kanarese poem is definitely fixed at about 850 A.D. This poem is full of Sanskrit words and ideas and it is quite allowable to suppose that the Tamil poems which are known to have excluded Sanskrit words in reaction to Sanskrit influence superseded older works of clearly Sanskrit tendencies.

48. Caldwell's conclusion is therefore unsatisfactory, because an attribution to independent development or to pre-Sanskritic elements is unnecessary when reference to Sanskrit provides a completely adequate explanation. He himself says (p. 220) "Every noun or pronoun in which the idea of gender is formally expressed, being a compound word, is necessarily of later origin than the uncompounded primitives." And although Mr. Subbaiya (Ind. Ant. 1911, p. 184) is of opinion that he misunderstands the formation of these compound words, Caldwell in fact derives them (pp. 223,227) from independent substances meaning "male and female" and a neuter demonstrative or suffix, a theory which Mr. Subbaiya accepts. Caldwell is perhaps misled by an idea that the Dravidian gender terminations must be derivable from Sanskrit forms in order to be considered of Sanskrit origin, but it is not the terminations themselves, but their construction which is Indo-Aryan.

49. The Dravidian distinction between rational and irrational beings (not animate and inanimate beings, since, this is the Munda, not the Dravidian distinction; cf. L.S.I. Munda-Dravidian, pp. 23, 289 and the Kanarese words *yettu,* bullock, *hasu* cow, *kusu,* child, which are all neuter) is found in the Marathi and Gujarati syntax. Firstly, the object of a transitive verb is put in the oblique case, if rational and in the direct or nominative accusative case if irrational and secondly, the agreement of a verb or of a predicate adjective varies according to the rationality or irrationality of the subject. (cf. Bloch 180, 271).

50. As regards the first point it is true that the grammarians make the distinction between animate and inanimate beings.(Navalkar §488-491 ; Taylor §134) but I have found the usage, though

fluctuating, to favour the distinction between rational and irrational[73] Navalkar (§491 note) states that noun denoting irrational animals are *usually* put in the dative (*i.e.*, the inflected) case, showing that the practice is not uniform and instances of the use of the direct or nominative-accusative case are easily found Marathi *ḍukrcṁcārāvayās*, to feed swine, (L.S.I. Mar., p. 37) Gujarati *bakrāṁ carto hato* (Taylor, p. 224) he was feeding goats. But, curiously enough according to the grammars Kanarese does not follow either practice and the correct grammatical accusative of *mātu*, a word, is *mātannu*, although as Ziegler says (p. 16, note 3) "The crude form (*i.e.*, *mātu*) is often used instead of the accusative case where it can be done without ambiguity." The use of the nominative or base as the accusative of neuter nouns is the ordinary and almost universal colloquial use of Tamil-Malayalam and is often found even in classical compositions. The accusative case termination may be suffixed, either for the sake of euphony or to prevent ambiguity. (Caldwell 271). But this use is not found in Marathi and Gujarati. Tamil-Malayalam masculine and feminine nouns invariably take the accusative case suffix when they are governed by active verbs. In Telugu the use of the nominative for the accusative is confined to things without life. The dialect of the *Tuḍas* uses the nominative in the case of all nouns but uses the accusative for personal pronouns (Caldwell 271). Spoken Kanarese retains the distinction between rational and irrational; *Kudure kaṇḍu koṇḍar'enu*, have they found the horse? (Ziegler, p. 53) It seems probable, therefore, that the use of the accusative for irrational objects is due to the desire of grammarians to secure uniformity. Its use in the case of irrational animals (*i.e.*, animate things) in spoken Telugu may be due to *Muṇḍā* influence, in view of the close proximity of the Telugu and Muṇḍā areas. But Marathi and Gujarati which are contiguous to and superimposed upon the Kanarese-speaking areas, would naturally, follow the Kanarese practice.

51. With regard to the second point, we find Navalkar (§486.3) laying down the rule that the verb often agrees with the last

[73] Cf. Taylor §36. The plural forms of '*te*' (the demonstrative pronoun) are freely employed with reference to human beings, but seldom with reference to the lower animals and to inanimate objects.

of two or more irrational animals or inanimate objects *e.g.*, *āmcī gāi āṇi ghoḍa ālā nāhīṁ*, our cow and horse have not come. Taylor(§121 B) gives an example—*ghoḍo keghoḍi langaḍī hoy to* if the horse or mare be lame; but does not specifically differentiate between irrational and rational beings. But as in Marathi and Gujarati nouns of different genders have generally, whether masculine, feminine or neuter, a neuter predicate, it is difficult to formulate any rule based on the distinction between rational and irrational objects. And even, if such a rule could be formulated, it would appear to have no parallel in Dravidian. If Navalkar is correct, we have a phenomenon of great interest, a construction which is not of Aryan or Dravidian origin. But his interpretation is doubtful.

§13. *Case—Crude form.*

52. The cases of Marathi, Gujarati and Kanarese although they have been arranged on a similar plan by grammarians, do not show many points in common. Those of Marathi and Gujarati are partly the remains of more ancient Sanskrit cases and partly postpositions, while the Kanarese cases are all except the nominative, vocative, and genitive made by postpositions. Caldwell (p. 255) refers to the absence of nominative case terminations in Dravidian and there are none in Kanarese. The crude form as it is called in Marathi by Navalkar is, however, used in the nominative of certain declensions; but as a rule the crude form is not found in the nominative and dative. So we find with *arasu:* genitive, *arasina*; dative, *arasige* and *arasanu*; genitive, *arasana*; dative: *arasaṇige* from Sanskrit *rājā* as alternative declensions. In Gujarati there is a distinct crude-form only for nouns with a case termination in the nominative, either masculine or neuter, otherwise the nominative is used. In Marathi there is a distinct crude form for all, except feminine words ending in *i* and certain words ending in *o* and *u*. It is reasonable to suppose that the crude form is due in Indo-Aryan to an attempt to reconcile the Dravidian with the Aryan idiom during a period when the Prakrit case-endings were becoming supplanted by the Dravidian postposition and that its use in Dravidian was an imitation of the Indo-Aryan compromise.

§ 14. *Genitive.*

53. It is the genitive that one expects to find at the base of the modern oblique case (Bloch § 183) and it is precisely the genitive which in Kanarese is the normal crude form. It appears that in the singular the oblique case in Marathi and Gujarati is derivable not from the genitive but from the dative of Sanskrit (Bloch § 183); but this fact does not mean that it did not come into use as a crude form after taking the place of the genitive. The significant Prakrit *majjham* from the dative *mahyam* which has become the genitive *mājhā* and the crude form *maj* in Marathi quoted by Bloch (§183) has evolved into an unquestionable genitive. It is possible to argue that the disuse of the Sanskrit case-endings was initiated and promoted by the Scythian or Tātar invasions. On the assumption that their language was a form of Tūrkī, it may be pointed out that in Eastern Tūrkī the postpositions are affixed direct to the nominative, e.g., *āt* horse. Genetive *āt-ning* dative *āt -ghā* (Shaw—J. A. S. B. 1877, No. 3 p. 243). This language is purely agglutinative and has no genders. It could in the past have hardly been more primitive than it is now. The genitive *ning* can be traced to an old word meaning "property" but the Dravidian genitive is formed by the nominative either by lengthening the final syllable or not; or by adding a neuter pronoun, which is used also for turning an adjective into a predicate (see Caldwell, pp. 286-287) and is perhaps identical with the adjectival ending of the verb-relative. The genitive of Tūrkī is therefore neither in origin nor use similar to the genitive of Dravidian, and it is only in appearance that the use of the nominative as a base for the cases in Tūrkī and its use in Kanarese correspond; for in Kanarese it is the nominative turned into a genitive and not the nominative itself which becomes the crude form. There is in Kanarese an exception and that is the dative. It has the form of an inflexion and not of a case-ending in certain declensions.

54. The locative also exhibits alternative forms—*ūru* a village, *ūralli* or *ūrinalli*, in a village. *Ūralli* is the popular and possibly the older form. It might be supposed from these forms that Kanarese possessed at a very early stage a genuine declensional system with a nominative, dative, genitive and locative. But

there exist still especially in the popular speech, vigorous relics of an agglutinative system and the synthetic elements of the language are admitted to be a comparatively late development. Kanarese could even now throw overboard much of its synthetic tophamper and yet be intelligible. The modern Indo-Aryan languages would find it more difficult to do so and middle Indo-Aryan would be a wreck without its synthetic processes.

55. The Dravidian languages indeed appear to have been influenced by their Aryan neighbours in this respect. In old Kanarese according to the grammarians there is no such thing as an adjective; the noun itself is used as an adjective. The genitive is an adjective in sense, and in primitive Kanarese or its ancestor the nominative may have been used as a genitive or as an adjective indifferently. *Biḷi* means white or whiteness and "*biḷe kudure*" "a white horse", "*tande kudure*" is "father's horse,"*tande* being a lengthened form of *tande.*

56. This suggestion does not conflict with the fact pointed out in para. 11 that *Tūrkī* does not possess a crude form and cannot therefore have suggested the crude form of Marathi and Gujarati. The mutual influence of Aryan and Dravidian acting over centuries alone could produce that approximation of inflexion which now exists in the modern Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages. The method by which Aryan influence brought about the existence of a genitive was presumably first by the lengthening of the last syllable of the nominative and then by the addition of the locative and pronominal endings. The primitive use would have been the early use of an agglutinative language which involves postpositions in direct contact with the nominative. A synthetic language cannot logically accept that position and must if it adopts postpositions relate them to some case, which logically would be the genitive. According to this theory Gujarati and Marathi would derive their use of postpositions from Kanarese (or Dravidian) and have given the use of their inflections to Kanarese.

57. The genitive is also used in Kanarese to form a base for an adjective. So we find *nāmadavaru* (Kanarese Infants' primer, lesson 3) meaning " bearers of marks " *nāmada* being the genitive of *nāma* (*vu*) with *avaru,* the pronoun meaning 'they' attached.

In both Gujarati and Marathi the genitive is (as Dr. Bloch states) a true adjective with genders and a crude form; but an adjective only in form and not in meaning. The use of the genitive made up of the nominative and genitive ending, (instead of the crude form and genitive ending) as an adjective both in form and meaning, *e.g.*, *gāṁvcā*, rustic compared with *gāṁvācā* 'of a village' is peculiar to Marathi.

58. Finally there is a use of the genitive with postpositions to be found both in Kanarese, Marathi and Gujarati. The genitive ending is placed after a noun with a postposition forming an adjective. So Kanarese *sāley-oḷage* in a school and *sāley-oḷagina pāṭha*—a lesson in a school, *sāleya* being the genitive of *sāle* and *oḷagina* the genitive of *oḷage*, within (Kanarese Infants' primer lesson 8); Marathi *toṁḍīṁcā toṁḍāṁtalā* in the mouth (cf. Navalkar § 353); and Gujarati, *temāṁno*, in it (cf. Taylor §113). The Kanarese is not inflected for gender, as adjectives are not so treated but the Marathi and Gujarati forms are regularly inflected. This formation which is similar to but not to be compounded with the accumulation of postpositions, is common in Dravidian.

§ 15 *Dative.*

59. In Marathi and Gujarati the Dative is also used as an Accusative. In Kanarese the Dative is a separate form from the Accusative. The forms of the Dative are in Marathi, - *s* and - *lā*, in Gujarati, - *ne* and in Kanarese, - *ge* or, - *kke*. In all three languages the Dative is used with its normal meaning, but in Marathi and Kanarese it has in certain cases the sense of a locative both of motion, time at which, and price at which (thus agreeing in the first two senses at least with Hindustani). So Kanarese *manege hōdaḷu*, she went to the house (Zieg. p. 59) Marathi *to gāṁvālā gelā*, he went to town (Nav. §588 6 (*b*)) but Gujarati *te kheḍe gayo*, he went to Kaira (Taylor §138). Marathi *kāl rātrīs tūṁ koṭheṁ hotās*, where were you last night? (Nav. id 7 (*b*)) Kanarese *sāyaṅkālakke bā*, come in the evening (Spencer p. 183); but Gujarati *sāñje āvo*, come in the evening. Kanarese goes further (*y*) *esṭu ghaṇṭege baruli*, at what hour am I to come? while Marathi uses the form *kitīvājtāṁ* (of locative origin) and Gujarati

keṭalevāge, with the ordinary locative ending. For 'price at which' we find Kanarese *(y)eraḍu rupāyige kōḍuttene*, I will give it for two rupees. (Spencer 182), *vārakke kōḍu*, give (land) on cropshare (Kittel Dict. s. v. *Vār.*) and Marathi *to hajār rupayāṁlā melā*, he went bankrupt to the extent of one thousand rupees (Naval. §588 *d*), but Gujarati *meṁ ā ghoḍo pacās rūpiye līdho*, I bought this horse for fifty rupees (Taylor §138).

60. The use of the Dative as a Locative in the comparison of adjectives is found in Kanarese alone, Gujarati and Marathi both using a distinct postposition or the ablative. (See later §17.)

61. Kanarese has moreover a peculiar use of the termination *-ge* in such adverbs and postpositions as *hāṅge* thus, *keḷage*, below *horage*, outside, *(w)oḷage* in. Spencer (p. 112) and Ziegler (p. 9) consider that in these words - *e* has a locative significance and that they are formed from the nouns *horagu*, etc., which consist of a a root[74] (in some cases verbal as well as nominal) with the formative suffix - *gu*. These nouns actually exist. Kittel however, (pp. 169 and 260), connects — *age* with *āgi* the modern adverbial termination and derives them both from *āge* (so that it becomes). He presumably has not considered the possibility of - *e* being a locative, because it is never used as a locative termination of nouns[75] (see Kittels' exhaustive list p. 84). His explanation, however, will not account for such words as *(w)oḷage* except by analogy. There are, moreover, several adverbs which have admittedly dative terminations, *beḷigge* in the morning for *beḷagige; bagge*, concerning, for *bagage*, from *bage*, intention; *varege* as far as, from *vare*, limit[76]. There are a number of adverbs ending in - *e* as *mele*, upon, but they are probably just the crude base or root, as is found in *vare*, *bage*, above. There are grounds, therefore, for believing that the locative use of the dative is originally Kanarese. I have no materials for alleging it to be Dravidian, but the Tamil for 'come at four o'clock' is *nālu manikki vā*, where *manikki* is the

---

74 That is to say *hor*, *(w)oḷ*, etc. + — *gu*.

75 *(w) ol*, *(w)oḷage*; —*alli* and its variants and —*i* are the forms found.

76 (Spencer pp. 112, 120) Also *i mirege*, in this way. K.S.B. Less. 3.

dative of *mani*, hour (Ferguson p. 3.)[77] and the use is probably not confined to Kanarese.

62. Another, but rare use of the Dative in Kanarese is as an oblique form with a postposition — *ōskara*, for the sake of and *inta* than, take this construction—e.g., *namagōskara*, for our sakes, *idakkinta*, than this (Spencer pp. 117-8). It is difficult to avoid connecting this use of - *ge* and - *ke* with the use of the Sinhalese genitive - *ge* (v. Block §202). Both this form and the Hindustani - *ko*, - *kā* - *kī* are derived from Sanskrit originals (*gṛhe* and *kṛta*), but the deciding factor in the choice of the particular form may have been the existence of similar Dravidian forms. Alternatively, the Dravidian forms may have been adopted from Indo-Aryan.

CHAPTER V.—ADJECTIVES.

Section 16—Adjectives.

63. There are no adjectives proper in Kanarese (Spencer p. 167), but what are called adjective nouns take their place. These have the usual genders — *cikka-vanu*, a little man, *cikkavaḷu*, a little woman, *cikkadu* a little thing. These are used as nouns proper and predicatively as adjectives. The crude form *cikka* is used in the ordinary adjectival sense as *cikka mane*, a small house. A number of these crude forms are actually regarded as nouns as (*w*)*oḷḷe*, goodness, *biḷi* whiteness and are generally written with the last syllable lengthened to denote the genitive case. Sanskrit-derived adjectives receive a different treatment when used with Kanarese words (Spencer p. 173).

§ 17 *Comparison of Adjectives.*

64. The treatment of comparison in Kanarese is in conformity with the above theory. The comparative is expressed by the simple adjective-noun and the thing compared in the locative-dative (§15) or the locative-ablative, a special form,—*nanna kuduregе ninna kudure doḍḍadu*, your horse is larger than mine. lit. among my horses your horse is a large thing (cf. Caldwell pp. 316-317).

[77] Ferguson *Iñge vā* Colombo 1907. Compare also the use of Hindustani — *ko*.

When the locative-ablative is used, it is combined with the locative dative as *kudureyu nāyiginta doḍḍāgide*, a horse is larger than a dog. Kittel pp. 378, 379, gives examples, apparently from old or middle Kanarese, of the use of the ablative or instrumental, (derived from the locative) applied to the noun theme and not to its dative.

65. The superlative is expressed in much the same way, but generally with the addition of (*y*)*ella*, all or its equivalents or by the addition of the intensive particle *u* to the dative or by a combination of both. The ordinary locative *-alli* is also used with or without (*y*)*ella*—(*y*)*ella kuduregaḷiginta ā kudureyu doḍḍadāgide*, that horse is the largest of horses; *sāsi vekāḷu bijagaḷalli saṇṇadu*, a grain of mustard is the smallest of seeds (Spencer p. 178) *namma aṇṇanu yellarigu hireyanu*, my eldest brother is the biggest (K.F.B., less: 5); *ivanu* (*y*)*ellaralli doḍḍavanu*, he is the eldest son of all (Ziegler p. 22). Similarly in Marathi and Gujarati the adjective is not inflected for comparison. To the thing compared is affixed the locative Marathi *pekṣāṁ*, Gujarati *kartāṁ* or the ablative Marathi *hūn*, Gujarati *-thi*, as—Marathi *Sūryāpekṣāṁ lahān*, smaller than the sun, and *pāṇyāpekṣāṁ halkeṁ*, lighter than water (Navalkar §522); Gujarati *tamārā kartāṁ uñcuṁ*, taller than you; *māthāthi moṭuṁ*, larger than the head. (Taylor §28A.) For the superlative we find the ordinary locative form also used. Marathi *sarva mulāṁ pekṣāṁ śahāṇā*, wisest of boys (*or mulāṁ hūn*); *sarva āmbyāṁt moṭhā*, largest mango; (*kāvyeṣu nāṭakam ramyam* 'among poetical compositions the drama is the most pleasant,' is a Sanskrit idiom quoted by Navalkar as similar to the Marathi idiom, (Navalkar §§523, 524) and Gujarati *moṭāmāṁ moṭuṁ, sarvathī moṭuṁ*, largest (Taylor §28 B.)

66. The idea of "very" expressed by a separate word found in Marathi and Gujarati is found also in Kanarese as an Aryan borrowing, but the repetition of the adjective to denote the same idea found again in all three languages is the natural method in Kanarese.

67. *Excess.* The idea of excess is conspicuously absent from Indian languages, Aryan or Dravidian, the simple adjective or adverb being used as a rule. The words Kanarese *heccu* excess, Marath

adhik excessive, Gujarati *vadhāre* more, although used on occasions, are obviously late adaptations or borrowings, the Gujarati word being formed from the noun *vadhāro*, excess. The use of the simple adjective to denote excess is consistent with its use to denote comparison.

68. *Equality*. The idea of equality or likeness is expressed in Kanarese by the genitive with *antha*, such *aṣṭu*, so much and so on, as *nammanthavaru*, people like ourselves. I have not, however, actually met with *aṣṭu*, used except with a sentence. In Marathi and Gujarati the same senses are expressed by Marathi *itkā*, *evaḍhā*, Gujarati *jevo*, *jevaḍo* etc., with the crude form of the genitive or the simple crude form. Marathi *mājhyā iṭka taruṇ*, as young as I. Gujarati *bāpmā jevo*, like his father (Spencer p. 103. Navalkar §525. *cf.* Taylor, §97.) The above forms are usually classed as pronouns, but I have followed Navalkar in considering them under the head 'Adjectives.'

69. Other methods of expressing similarity in Marathi and Gujarati are by adjectives, as Marathi *sārakhā*, Gujarati *sarakhuṁ* or by adverbs as Marathi *pramāṇeṁ*, Gujarati *peṭhe*; while Kanarese clings to the pronominal adverb, when it does not use the pronominal adjective—*tandeya hāge maganu* the son is like the father; lit: like the father the son (is); *hāge* means "thus" and while in common use in this sense as a pure adverb, it is also commonly used as a postposition as above. The pronominal use is developed more fully in Kanarese than in the Marathi or Gujarati. It is observing of notice that Marathi which uses the demonstrative form of the pronominal adjective keeps closer to Kanarese than Gujarati which uses the relative form. Kanarese has no relative pronouns, and while the practice of Marathi is intelligible as deriving from Kanarese, that of Gujarati is entirely illogical and appears due to an Aryanization of a Dravidian turn of phrase.

§ 17 *Pronouns.*

70. There is nothing in common between the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian pronouns except in the use of the words meaning 'self.' Marathi *āpaṇ*; Gujarati *āpaṇ*, *āp*; Kanarese *tānu*.

(1) Marathi *āpaṇ* and Kanarese *tānu* are used in a reflexive

sense, but in Gujarati *āp* rarely and *āpaṇ* never. *Pote*, *potāno* are used instead. Marathi and Kanarese are particular that the subject of a sentence shall be followed by the reflexive possessive pronoun, but in Gujarati it is unnecessary. Marathi *mīṁ āpalya gharānt rāhīn* I will remain in my house (Navalkar § 539) Kanarese *avanu tanna sevakannu kaḷuhisidanu*, he sent his servant (Spencer p. 83), but Gujarati *teonī āgaḷ tamārā dāndharma karvāthī sāvdhān raho*, beware of doing your charities before them (i.e., men) (Taylor p. 244). This is a peculiarity of Gujarati even as compared with other "inner" languages.

(2) *Āpaṇ* Marathi and Gujarati is used in the sense of inclusive "we." *āpaṇ sagaḷā divas pāhije teṁ karūṁ* we, shall do whatever we like the whole day (Navalkar §544); Gujarati *ame* exclusive "we" and *apaṇ* or *apaṇe* inclusive "we" (Taylor § 31). It is to be noted that Kanarese does not use *tāvu*, (*tamma*)[78] in this way and in this respect it differs from all other Dravidian dialects (Caldwell p. 414).

(3) Marathi *āpaṇ*, Gujarati *āp* and Kanarese *tāvu* is used as a term of respect. It should be observed that the genitive of *āpaṇ* is *āplā* and of *āp* *āpno* not *āpaṇācā*, and *āpṇo*, which might be expected, the Gujarati *āpṇo* being reserved for the word expressing inclusive "we." The circumstances are peculiar and it is possible that the word *āp*, if not derived from, was identified with the Kanarese *appa* which is found in Gujarati as *āpo*, (a shepherd's term for "father") and Marathi *āpā* (a respectful term used for elders); in Hemacandra (Deśi. I. 6.) as *appo* with the meaning of *pitā* (father), but not in Dhanapāla, who in his *Pāialacchī* has apparently done his best to exclude *deśi* words. The form *āpaṇ* in Marathi clearly shews that it was identified at some stage with the reflexive and it may be that *āp*, *āplā* and *āpaṇ* *āpaṇācā*, have been thus simplified into two forms.

71. *Mī* or *Mīṁ* for the nominative singular "I" has been discussed by Dr. Bloch (§208) and he suggests that the form may have been derived from the instrumental. Kanarese has an instrumental, but it is only the adoption of Indo-Aryan forms that has

[78] cf. Sinh. tamā.

made it need one. If the view I have taken of the Kanarese or Dravidian origin of the Kanarese construction (see §23) is correct, no further explanation of the form *mī* is necessary. ***Mīṁ*** would then be a comparatively late formation comparable with the Gujarati *meṁ* cf. *Apabhraṁśa-eṁ* Marathi-*eṁ*(Turner Indo-Aryan nasals in Gujarati 5.22)[70] and O. G.-*īṁ* (L.S.I. Gujarati p. 356) and *mī*, a simplified from of *mīṁ*.

Chapter VII

NUMERALS.

§18 *Cardinals.*

72. The Gujarati cardinals are indeclinable. The Marathi cardinals "one" to "four" inclusive are adjectives (declinable although irregularly) and from "five" onwards are either indeclinable adjectives or declinable substantives. The cardinals in Kanarese are declinable as far as "five" (Spencer p. 94 says "five" etc.,) but in practice they are only declined up to "three" inclusive. "One" has three genders and an epicene plural (masculine and feminine) used chiefly in a reflexive sense and the other numbers, a neuter singular form and an epicene plural. The number "four" has, however, unlike the others, a neuter form derived not from the number root plus the neuter singular ending *-du*, but from the number-root augmented by the formative *-ku* (Caldwell 321ff.). These formations are common to all Dravidian languages. At first it seems as though the Marathi use were Dravidian in origin, but this is not so. The Marathi use has a clear Indo-European origin (Bloch §212). The Gujarati use is a natural logical development (Beames ii. 243-4) from ancient Indo-Aryan forms. The Kanarese cardinals are substantives used as adjectives, for the Kanarese adjective is uninflected and becomes a noun by inflexion (See Adjectives § 16 and Caldwell p. 322). The Kanarese cardinal adjective is easily traceable from the existing cardinals. It is only possible, therefore, to come to the conclusion that the Marathi forms are genuine archaisms and that the Kanarese forms are due

---

[70] J.R.A.S. 1915.

to Indo-Aryan influence, probably through the grammarians. Inflection of substantives is probably a comparatively late process in Kanarese (see §12). In *Hindi* a plural form of cardinals is used in certain cases (Beames ii. 243) but genders are not distinguished and this corresponds to some extent with the Kanarese use in the numerals "two" to "five". Further the Kanarese grammatical theory and actual practice differ and the inconsistency indicates that the grammatical theory is inconvenient.

73. Numbers are susceptible to some extent to the influence of a dominant alien language. In fact Marathi numbers are often used by Kanarese speakers, who know otherwise no Marathi and the fact may be ascribed to their use in revenue administration. It is possibly owing to this use that the Indo-Aryan vernaculars now all use '*hajār*' a Persian word for "thousand" while the Dravidian languages use a derivative of the Sanskrit "Sahasra" (Caldwell p. 354.)

74. There is, however, a curious use of the cardinal *cār*, four which appears to be Dravidian in origin. Marathi-Gujarati *cār lok* is used to mean the people in general. In Marathi and Kanarese *cār* and *nālku*, four, mean not only that, but a vague number. There is an uncertainty whether the sense of 'few' or 'many' shall predominate. In Marathi there is *cohīṁkaḍe* on all sides (Navalkar §134), in Gujarati *cār lok*, the public, above quoted and in Kanarese *nālku jana* everyone, *nālku kelasa* many kinds of work (Kittel, Dictionary).

On the other hand we find in Marathi *cār akṣareṁ* a measure of erudition, *cār divas sāsūce, cār divas sunece*, the mother-in-law has a few days and the daughter-in-law has a few (Molesworth's Dictionary); in Gujarati *cār vāt kahīne vālīś*, I shall dissuade him in a few words, *cār lokmāṁ gaṇāvuṁ*, to be counted as one of the upper ten (Belsare Dictionary) and in Kanarese *nālku divasa*, a few days. It cannot be definitely said that Indo-Aryan favours the sense of "few" and Dravidian that of "many," although this is a *a priori* probable. Caldwell points out that in poetical Tamil *nal* means abundant and when comparing this word (p. 335) with the Tamil use of *nāl* four for 'many, general' suggests a connection between the two words. There appears then to have been a confusion

of a Dravidian word meaning "many" with the number "four" used in the sense of "several" "a few". This confusion was imported into Indo-Aryan, but the meaning of "several" rather than that of "many" would predominate. I am not sure, however, how far the Dictionaries have been misled by a desire to be logical. Take *cār vāt kahīne vāliś*. I personally should translate it "I shall get round him somehow," the main idea not being that it is easy to dissuade him, but that I am confident of doing it. The Marathi *cārgoṣṭi sāṅgṇeṁ*, to use persuasive arguments (Molesworth Dictionary), does not emphasize the fewness of the arguments. It is better, therefore, not to make too close an analysis, but to rest content with the identification of the idioms. Numbers are used in all languages to express an indefinite meaning and the idiom in this case is the use of the number "four" not merely the use of a number.

§ 19 *Distributives.*

75. In Marathi and Gujarati the sense of distribution is expressed by repeating the cardinals—Marathi *dondon āmbe āṇā*, bring two mangoes at a time (Navakar §148), Gujarati *Keṭalāeke ek ek dorḍe cālīs cālīs bakrāṁ bāndhāyaṁ hatāṁ*, some had tied up forty goats, each to one rope (Khansaheb and Sheth, Gujarati Grammar 4th Ed. §70). In Marathi *harek, darek* (from the Persian) and *pratyek* (Sanskrit) and in Gujarati *darek, dar*, and *har*, in phrases such as *dar roj* each day, *har dam* every moment, are quite regular but not in general use. They represent the Aryan idiom. The Persian words were introduced during the period of Mahommadan influence, (the early Marathi Bakhars are markedly persianised as compared with later prose) and the sanskritisation is due to the Poona Pandits of the Maratha empire, whose influence did not affect Gujarati so profoundly as Marathi. In Kanarese reduplication is freely used. Not only is it possible to say *wobb' obbarige yeraḍ 'eraḍu rūpāyi koḍuttene,* I shall give them two rupees each (lit: to one one (pl) two two rupees (give), but the reflexive is expressed in the same way, *wobbara hind 'obbara hoguttāre*, they go one behind the other (Ziegler 101). Marathi and Gujarati would express this by reduplication of the reflexive *āpāpalyā pāṭhīmāgem jātāt* or *potpotānī pachvāḍe jāy*. Kanarese carries the principle still further by

reduplicating the substantive. So *hottuhottige nīru kuḍisuvanu* he gives (them) water to drink every day (Kanarese Sec. Book 1923 p. 15). But we find similar expressions in Marathi and Gujarati *roj roj*, day by day. The idiom is not exclusively Indian, for we find in Persian *yak yak gūsfand-rā mi-kusht*, he was slaughtering the sheep one by one (Ranking, Persian Grammar, 1911 §52). But in Persian the use is not so fully developed as in Kanarese and can be replaced with an alternative which Kanarese does not possess, nor indeed Gujarati or Marathi until they borrowed from Sanskrit and Persian.

76. Kanarese uses *manemanege*, meaning, from house to house, just like Marathi *gharghar* and Gujarati *ghareghar*. Navalkar (§419 a) gives instances which indicate distribution *mī gharghar phīraloṁ*, I visited every house, *Rāmāneṁ jhāḍ jhāḍ huḍakaleṁ* Rama searched each tree separately. Kittel Grammar p. 302 has *ī jāḷigeyoḷ, ivarige ponnaṁ ponnaṁ kuḍu*, give each one a gold coin out of the purse old Kanarese). I do not know of any similar reduplication of the substantive in Marathi or Gujarati.

BRIEF NOTE

BEQUESTS TO HEIRS: ISMĀ'ĪLĪ SHĪ'A LAW.

By A. A. A. Fyzee, M.A. (Cantab.), Barrister-at-Law.

The Ismā'īlī Shī'as in India may be divided generally in two different classes: the Khojas, believers in the Imamate of H. H. The Aga Khan, and generally known as the Eastern Ismā'īlīs; and the Bohras, that is the Dā'ūdīs and Sulaimānīs and their off-shoots, known as the Western Ismā'īlīs. The Khojas are governed in matters relating to Succession and Inheritance by the Hindu Law, and this has recently been discussed with ability by Mr. S. R. Dongerkerry in his article '*The Law applicable to Khojas and Cutchi Memons*'[1]. The Bohras on the other hand are governed by the Mahomedan Law.

Each sect in India is governed by its own laws,[2] therefore the question arises, by what rules of Law are the Bohras governed. Being Shī'as, it is generally supposed that the general Shī'a law, the Ithna' Ashari school of law governs them.[3] Ameer Ali maintains that as they have no system of their own, they are governed by the "general principles" of Mahomedan Law, whatever that vague expression may mean.[4] On the other hand Tyabji says that they are governed by their own peculiar system of law which is little known.[5] This last, it is submitted, is the correct position.

I have tried elsewhere to show that in the matter of Bequests to Heirs that branch of the Ismā'īlī Shī'as, generally called the Bohras, is governed by principles akin to those of Sunni Law.[6]

The Sunnīs following the well-known tradition of the Prophet,

---

[1] 1926, 28 *Bom. Law Rep.*, *Journal*, 129; and reprinted in 1929.

[2] Raja Deedar Husain, 2 M.I.A. 441.

[3] Wilson, 5th ed., 36; Advocate-General of Bombay *vs.* Yusufali 24 Bom. L.R. 1060, 1076.

[4] Ameer Ali, 5th ed., ii. 11 and 135.

[5] Tyabji, *Principles of Muhammadan Law*, 2nd ed., 33 and 787.

[6] *Bequests to Heirs: Shī'a Ismā'īlī Law*, 1929, 31 Bom. L.R., Journal, 84.

لا وصية لوارث [7], hold that no bequest can be made to an heir unless the other heirs consent to it after the testator's death.[8]

In this the Ismā'īlīs and the Zaidīs [9] agree with them.

The Ithna 'Asharis however hold that a bequest to an heir is perfectly valid even without the consent of other heirs.[10]

The *Da'ā'im ul-Islām* is a book of the highest authority amongst the Western Ismā'īlīs,[11] and it is unfortunate that it is neither printed nor translated fully, though the second volume has been summarised in Urdu for the use of the Sulaimānīs.[12] It was written by an-Nu'mān b. Muḥammad b. Manṣūr b. Ḥaiyān, (d. 363/974) described by Strothmann as 'The Abu Ḥanīfa of the Shī'ites.' [13] Manuscript copies of it are very rare and seldom allowed to be seen.

The extract which follows is of great interest because it is believed that it has not been published before. This may be compared with the translation of an extract given by Tyabji.[14]

كتاب دعائم الاسلام '

المجلد الثاني ' كتاب الوصايا '

ذكر ما يجوز من الوصايا وما لا يجوز منها '

...... وعن علي وابي جعفر وابي عبدالله صلعم انهم قالوا

لا وصية لوارث وهـذا اجماع فيما علمناه ولو جازت الوصية

[7] Wensinck, *Early Muhammadan Tradition*, 251.

[8] Detailed references are unnecessary. In addition to those mentioned in my art. supra, cf. *Hidāya*, kitāb ul-Wasāya, iv, 655, l. 3, ed. Delhi 1320 A. H.; and *Minhāj*, ed. Van den Berg ii, 260, l. 6 et seq.

[9] *Majmū'al-Fiqh* by Zaid ibn 'Alī, ed. Griffini, Milan, 1919, No. 912.

[10] Cf. particularly *Sharā'i' ul-Islam*, Calcutta ed., p. 252 l. 8-9.

[11] Art. on Bohora, *Enc. of Islam*. i, 739, a.; see also *Kashfal-Ḥujub wa'l-astār*, by Kantūrī, ed. Hidayet Husain, Bib. Indica Ser., Calcutta, 1912, p. 214, No. 1095.

[12] *Sharḥ ul-Masā'il*, by Ḥaji Ghulām Ḥusain Saheb, the religious head of the Sulaimānī sect. Muṣṭafā' I Press, Bombay, 1338, A.H.

[13] *Enc. of Islam*, sub 'Shī'a iv, 355a.

[14] *Principles of Muhammadan Law*, 2nd ed., 787-788.

للوارث لكان يعطي من الميراث اكثر مما سماه الله تعالي له ومن اوصي لوارثه فانما استقل حق الله ع ج الذى جعل له وخالف كتابه جل ذكره ومن خالف كتاب الله جل ذكره لم يجز فعله وقد جاءت رواية عن جعفر بن محمد دخلت من اجلها الشبهة علي بعض من انتحـــل قوله وهي انه سئل عن رجل اوصى لقرابته فقال يجوز ذلك لقول الله تعالي ان ترك خيرا ن الوصية للوالدين والاقربين والذى ذكرناه عنه و عن آبائه الطاهرين وهو اثبت وهو اجماع من المسلمين

وعن رسول الله صلي الله عليه وآله انه قال لاوصية لوارث قد فرض الله لاهل المواريث فرائضهم فان ثبت عن جعفر بن محمد ماذكرناه آخرا فانما عني بالوالدين والاقربين غير الوارثين كالقرابة الذين لايرثون يحجبهم من هو دونهم و كالوالدين المملوكين والمشركين وقد ذكرنا ذلك فيما تقدم ان المملوك يشترى من تراث وليه ويعتق ويرث باقيـــه و سنذكر فيما بعد ايضاح ذلک انشاءالله تعالي وقديكون المراد بالوصية الوالدين والاقربين بالمعروف وكما قال الله اي بما يستحقون بالميراث وهو المعروف كالرجل يحضره الموت فيوصى لورثته [لورثة] بماله علي فرائضهم او يدفع ذلك اليهم في حياته علي ما جعله الله لهم لئلا يتشاجروا فيه بعده او ينكر بعضهم بعضا قرابتهم منه

وقد جاء عن جعفر ابن محمـــد ع م انه قال في العطية للوارث والهبة في المرض الذى يموت منه المعطي والواهب انها غير جائزة و هذا يؤكد ما ذكرناه'

Extract from *Da'ā' im ul-Islām,* vol. ii; The book of wills (kitāb ul-wasāya); Chapter on lawful and unlawful Bequests:—

" . . . And (it is related) from 'Alī [15], and Abū Ja'far [16] and Abū 'Abdullāh[17], on whom be peace, that they said, 'There shall be no bequest to an heir.' And there is a consensus (of opinion) concerning this, as we have learnt it. And if bequest were permissible to the heir, verily a greater portion than that which has been fixed by God would be bequeathable to him. And he who bequeaths to his heir, verily he belittles the decision of God concerning him (*i.e.*, the heir), and acts contrary to His book, may His mention be honoured; and he who acts contrary to the Book of Allāh, may His mention be honoured, his act is unlawful.

And that which has been related from Ja'far b. Muḥammad[17] has created a doubt in the minds of those who adopt his view. And is this: when he was asked concerning a man who had made a bequest in favour of his relations, he answered that it was lawful because of the words of God, 'If he leaves property it is incumbent upon him to make a wasiyyat (will) to his parents and relations.'[18] And that view [19], which we have related from him [20], and from his pure ancestors, is more correct (or authentic) and there is a consensus about it among the Muslims.

And (it is related) from the Prophet of God, peace be on him and on his progeny, that he said 'There shall be no bequest to an heir.' God has assigned to the persons entitled to inherit their specific shares. And if that (opinion) which has been handed down from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad and mentioned by us latterly is authentic, in that case (we say) by 'parents and relations' are meant persons *other* than heirs, such as those relations who do not

---

[15] Zain ul-'ābidīn, the 4th Imam.

[16] Muḥammad al-Bāqir, the 5th Imam.

[17] Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, the 6th Imam.

[18] Qur'ān ed. Flügel, ii, 176; Muhammad Ali, ii, 180 and particularly foot-note 223, where he discusses this point; cf. also Bayḍāwī ed. Fleischer vol. 1. p. 100, l. 18 et seq., i.e., comment to Qur'an, ii, 176.

[19] See para 1 of the translation above.

[20] Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, the 6th Imam.

inherit, because they are excluded by others who are nearer in degree, like fathers who are slaves or non-Muslims.

And we have mentioned above, that as to a slave, the person who is the heir of his master can sell or emancipate him (the slave), and inherit the rest. And we shall discuss this matter fully hereafter, if God pleases.

And it is probable that the meaning of 'Bequests to parents and relations according to usage (or in reason)' is as God says (in the Qur'ān), that is, those that are entitled to a share in the inheritance. And this is known, as (for instance) a man who, when faced with death, bequeaths his property to his heirs in accordance with the shares fixed for them (by law); or divides his property in his own lifetime, according to the shares fixed by God, lest they might quarrel over it after his death, or that some may deny to others what is due to them on account of their relationship.

And it has been related from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, that concerning a gift to an heir he said, when a donor makes a gift (to an heir) during the course of a disease from which he dies, such a gift is not lawful. And this confirms what we have said before . . . ."

From the above it is clear that it would be an error to apply the ordinary Shī'a law, really the Ithna'Ashari law, in cases where the Ismā'īlīs and particularly the Dā'ūdīs and Sulaimānīs, are concerned. This is all the more important as only one author Tyabji has so far discussed this point.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

PRAMĀṆAMĪMĀṀSĀ AND SYĀDVĀDAMAÑJARĪ.

Pramāṇamīmaṁsā of Hemacandra and Syādvādaratnākara of Malliṣena, both edited with Sanskrit introduction and notes and published in the Ārhatamataprabhākara Series by Motilal Ladhaji at 196 *Bhavani Peth, Poona,* 1926.

Students of Jain Literature usually find it very hard to get good and critical editions of the important texts of Jainism. There are, no doubt, several Mālās and funds established by the Jains with a distinct aim to publish their literature, but what they publish is often uncritical and scarcely of any use to the non-Jains who desire to study Jain Literature. Of course, there are several exceptions. Again these funds work independently of each other and never keep their books with the well-known book-sellers. Hence it is often very difficult to know whether a Jain work is printed or not, and further to procure a copy of it.

Recently, however, the Jains seem to have realised the necessity of having good critical editions of their texts and also of giving them a greater circulation among the Non-Jains.

The Ārhata-Mata-Prabhākara Series, edited by Mr. Motilal Ladhajī of Poona aims at publishing rare Sanskrit and Prakrit texts of Jainism and we are glad to see that the editor has really succeeded in giving us good editions of Pramāṇamīmāṁsā and Syādvādamañjarī.

The former is a treatise on the proofs of knowledge by the famous Hemacandra, who lived at the time of King Kumārapāla of Gujarat. It contains five Adhyāyas, but only the first and a part of the second of these are now available ; the rest are supposed to be lost. It consists of Sūtras, accompanied by the author's own commentary. The first part of the first Adhyāya treats of the Pratyakṣa Pramāṇa while the second introduces the discussion of the Anumāna. The first part of the second Adhyāya only partly discusses the Parārthānumāna.

Syādvādamañjarī is a learned commentary by Malliṣeṇa on the Anyayogavyavaccheda-dvātriṁśikā of Hemacandra, a small Stotra of Jina, in 32 stanzas, which attempts the refutation of other theological and philosophical systems. The commentator quotes profusely

and does his task very creditably, of giving a complete and clear exposition of the Pūrvapakṣa and the Siddhānta views.

In his Sanskrit introductions the editor gives brief information about the works and their authors. The indexes and lists of quoted authorities with an attempt to identify them, given by the editor, have greatly added to the utility of the publications. Thus also, the passages from original works of the Pūrvapakṣa views, given in the introduction to the Syādvādamañjarī are very useful and afford great help to the reader in following the author's refutation of these.

H. D. VELANKAR.

THE INDIAN AND CHRISTIAN MIRACLES OF WALKING ON THE WATER, by WILLIAM NORMAN BROWN, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Pennsylvania. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, London, 1928.

The book is beautifully got up materially. A formidable array of quotations from a painstakingly up-to-date bibliography make the reader hope to hear the last word on the question as far as the present evidence warrants a decision. Exemplary neatness of arrangement and clearness of style make it impossible not to grasp the writer's mind. His courage too deserves recognition since in his opinion " Previous discussions of these miracles have been unconvincing, in part at least because never has all the material been assembled, nor has that which has been presented been correctly and fully interpreted." (Foreword.) It inspires confidence when the author confesses: " To demonstrate with mathematical inevitability that legends so remote geographically are connected genetically, one would need categorical textual testimony that they were transported from one region to the other, and there, though aliens, were welcomed by a native faith into its canonical lore. We have at present no such conclusive evidence." *loc. cit.* The same wariness rings in the author's statement about " the theme's progress from India westward ":

" Here we must at once confess that we are not able to deal in certainties, only in possibilities and probabilities

We have no positive and indisputable evidence that the early followers of Christ received the legends either directly or indirectly from the Buddhists; we cannot say that Buddhist books were taken to Syria by the first century A.D., for they have not been found there by that time either in the original or in translation. Nor does any author report for us as Buddhist legends tales of walking on the water. Our evidence is all inferential. Yet we can point to certain facts that make the 'loan theory' plausible." (P. 62). Even with a modicum of logic one is the more surprised to read only 7 pages later—3 of which are blank.—" The miracle of walking on the water, as it appears in Indian and Christian texts, originated in India, where its roots are found in the Rigveda before 800 B.C. The ways in which the miracle is effected are interchangeable, and so too are the means. The Indian stories were carried to Syria, presumably by Buddhists, where though strangers, they were so well received that at the time when legends were beginning to cluster around the name of Jesus some of them were attached to his figure." (P. 70).

How is it that the Potential (or Optative ?) Mood, carefully enough used in the body of the book, all of a sudden is changed into a confident Indicative in the " Conclusions "? Is it the desire to make the " loan theory " not only plausible, but to amount to finality, since in the opinion of Professor Brown " this theory provides a reasonable explanation of the New Testament legends, otherwise none is at hand." One crore of " may-bes " and " possiblies " will make one hard fact in history no more than in logic or metaphysics. The author himself is much too good and serious a scholar as not to concur with this maxim in handling a scientific problem.

There are two events in the New Testament that before others seem to lend countenance to the hypothesis that Buddhist sources contain the original which the Christian scriptures are supposed to have copied. The first is the story of Jesus walking on the water, Mark 6. 45-51, whose prototype is said to be found in the conversion of the Kassapas, Mahavagga 1. 20. 16, sculptured at Sanchi. The connection however is so loose that Prof. Brown

himself sees in the New Testament story " possibly a reflection " of the Buddhist narrative. This possible reflection need not detain us.

But the author continues: " Much stronger is the case for an Indian origin of the legend concerning Peter (Matthew 14. 22-33), which may convincingly be derived from a story of which one example is the introduction to Jātaka 190." Then " the history of the theme, as it concerns the legend of Peter " is given. This " history " starts with " Rigvedic notions " (*a*) of crossing a river by persuading a god to make it shallow; (*b*) by levitation; " both notions coming down into Buddhism." P. 69. Then four phases of the theme in Buddhist literature are given, all centering round the Buddha, the other actors being Yasa or some anonymous person. An apparent gap in the development is made up by a conjectural incident, for which " there is no text giving such an account." No. (6), the culminating point in the evolution of the story, runs as follows: " A lay disciple crosses a river to reach the Buddha by walking on its surface. His success is due to faith and meditation on the Buddha through which he attains ecstasy and the magic power of levitation, well established Buddhist notions. In the middle of the stream his faith and ecstasy wane and he sinks But he renews his faith and ecstasy, and gets across safely." From here Professor Brown gets himself across " safely " to his.

" (7) The story of Peter, which follows (6) closely, except for one departure: Peter, after his faith wanes, does not recover it, and hence has to be helped back into the boat, to the accompaniment of Christ's reproaches." Follows the serene conclusion:

" With only a few minor variations, due to the natural changes in a strange environment, the story concerning Peter reproduces that of the Buddhist lay disciple." P. 70.

The author's statement in No. (6) is based upon the " celebrated story of the present introducing Jātaka 190, which has often been compared with the story of Peter walking on the water, but as far as I am aware has never been fixed in its Indian environment." P. 27. The author considers this bit of Buddhist literature as the pièce de resistance for his conclusions, and—if we are not

mistaken—his claim to have more "correctly and fully interpreted" the material available than his predecessors. "It is as follows":

Behold the fruit of faith! This parable was related by the Teacher while he was in residence at the Jetavana monastery. At eventide he (?) reached the bank of the river Aciravatī, after the boatmen had reached his boat and gone to hear the preaching of the Doctrine.

Not seeing a boat, he had recourse to the Practice of Meditation concentrated his thoughts on the Buddha, attained the Ecstasy of Joy, and descended into the river. His feet did not sink in the water. He walked along as though he were walking on the surface of land until he came to midstream. Then he saw waves. Then the Ecstasy of Joy, the result of the concentration of his thoughts on the Buddha, became weak. Then his feet began to sink. But he concentrated his thoughts anew on the Buddha, strengthened the Ecstasy of Joy, walked on the surface of the water as before, entered Jetavana monastery, bowed to the Teacher and sat down on one side.

The Teacher exchanged greetings with him, and asked: "Lay disciple, I trust that as you came hither, you came hither without weariness." "Reverend Sir, I had recourse to the Practice of Meditation, concentrated my thoughts on the Buddha, attained the Ecstasy of Joy, obtained support on the surface of the water, and came hither as though I were treading the earth."

We will not quarrel about the translation, which is by Burlingname, Buddhist Parables, p. 186. About the date and the historicity of this piece of evidence for the loan theory, the learned author himself may give his view:

"The text in which the Jātaka story is found cannot be dated earlier than the fifth century A.D., a fact which has often been unduly emphasized; for the truth is, as we now see, that the elements of the tale are drawn from exceedingly ancient sources, and the tale itself is the culmination of a long legendary tradition. In view of these facts, we have good reason to accept the implication of the Pali text that the story, so well grounded, is ancient; it certainly could have been; and since the Jātakas, like most Indian works, are absolutely devoid of any consciousness

of time or textual historicity, we may more easily accept their implication here than reject it." Pp. 28-9.

Except the following reservations, any unbiassed critic will agree with this statement of the learned author. The question is not about "elements of the tale," said to be drawn from exceedingly ancient sources (?), but about the whole tale as such. For this is supposed to be the pattern of the New Testament story not isolated elements. The whole tale "cannot be dated earlier than the fifth century A.D.," the New Testament narratives were written during the first century A.D. In view of the fact that in ancient Buddhist literature, as well as in foreign, especially Chinese, translations, only elements are given, "and the tale itself is the culmination of a long legendary tradition," we have good reason not to accept that the Pali text of the Jātaka implies that the story itself is ancient, since it is not developed from a corresponding nucleus in the older strata of Buddhist literature. "It certainly could have been," the Professor says philosophically, but the question is one of fact, not of possibility. The historical situation is not much improved by the Professor's pronouncement that "the Jātakas, like most Indian works, are absolutely devoid of any consciousness of time or textual historicity." For, if the Jātakas are "devoid of any consciousness of time or textual historicity," they are so either intentionally or unintentionally. In neither case they can form the basis for genetically explaining the historical origin of the Gospel stories, and it is unintelligible how such an able and serious writer is wasting his time by attempting to draw historical conclusions from unhistorical sources. The situation being what it is, if the "loan theory" has, at all cost, to be applied to the present case, it would be methodically safer to say that the Jātakas borrowed from the New Testament than vice versa—at least as long as chronology of facts and sources is made to count something in history.

The next duty is the analysis of the parallelism of the event in the two texts in regard of which the writer says: "With only a few minor variations, due to natural changes in a strange environment, the story concerning Peter reproduces that of the Buddhist lay disciple." One of these minor variations has been pointed

out by Professor Brown himself on p. 29 :—" The chief of the pre-Christian stories illustrating the theme are Buddhist ; and in them the Buddha never walks on the water, he only flies across it, or disappears and reappears in another place. It is lesser persons who walk upon its surface." In the New Testament it is Christ who walks on the water, only one lesser person attempts it and fails. In the Buddhist " pattern " the Buddha is at the Jetavana monastery when the disciple crosses " magically " the river ; in the New Testament " copy," Christ is present when the disciple tries to walk on the lake. The Buddhist disciple was in an " Ecstasy of Joy, the result of the concentration of his thoughts on the Buddha " ; no such Ecstasy of Joy is related of Peter who stepped out of the boat on the water at the bidding of Christ and relying on his words. The momentary lapse is common to both ; but in the Jātaka the Buddhist disciple saves himself by concentrating his thoughts anew on the Buddha and strengthening the Ecstasy of Joy, obtaining thus support on the surface of the water. Peter, on the other hand, fails in his faith, sinks, does not regain faith and confidence, and but for the rescuing hand of Christ would have perished in the water. To put it plainly : the Buddhist " original " shows a successful, the Christian " copy " an unsuccessful attempt at walking on the water. This failure could not but go against Peter, and the writer of the Gospel narrative was either a very clumsy or just as shrewd a copyist of the pattern, or—and this is an alternative which does not seem to have struck Professor Brown—the writer of the Gospel of St. Matthew related an independent historical fact. There is hardly anything parallel in the two narratives except the initial walking and the momentary lapse on the part of the persons concerned, and the water, on the Buddhist side a river, on the Christian side a lake however. About the depth of either we know too little to draw any conclusions from it. In ordinary speech success is not called a minor variation of failure ; about the nature of the other differences between the two narratives the reader may judge and fix their nomenclature.

There is however some truth to be found in the writer's remark about the minor variations which, he says, are due to natural changes in a strange environment. Though that strange environ-

ment does not explain the differences in the two narratives, it makes one doubt very much whether the strictly monotheistic Semitic writers of the Gospels would have stooped to pick up elements of a story about which it may just have been known that ultimately it had been imported from the Far East, but which had to be changed almost beyond recognition to suit the purpose. Why not suppose that these writers invented the story straightway if they relate only fiction? These writers, by no means foreigners to the knowledge and culture of their times, were too good Jews to accept and assimilate a story, or rather elements of a story, of such uncertain and strange provenience.

After the analysis of the parallel events and the inquiry into the sources there remain a few considerations of a more general nature arising out of the principle following which the loan theory may or may not be applied to certain cases. Professor Brown says on p. 59: "Although a single idea of fiction may arise spontaneously in different quarters of the world, it is wholly unlikely that parallel stories containing a number of similar ideas woven together into a coherent whole should so originate. If we regard the incidents and psychic motifs of stories as units, we may say that similar units may exist independently in widely separated communities, but similar groupings of incidents are not likely to exist independently." The analysis given above shows that not a number of similar ideas woven together or groupings are parallel in the Indian "sources" and the New Testament, but only two or three elements or units of groups, that the differences separating the units of the whole group on either side prevent them from being assembled into the same composite event, so that one narrative could be derived either directly or by evolution from the other. The parallelism falls by the very principle postulated by the writer. Besides, the principle that groups of ideas demand the exclusive explanation by borrowing has been disproved in important cases. Cumont's attempt to explain the sacramental system of the Christian church by syncretism on the part of Christianity has not been accepted. Morgan's views on the Primitive Marriage, and Hildebrant's hypothesis on the primitive form of the State, both based on the loan theory, were likewise rejected. Perhaps it is not even

borne out by empiric observation, as Professor Brown assumes, "That there is very little likelihood that stories came from Eurasia to the American Indians before the time of Columbus ; hence it is only in keeping with this fact that there is so little between the folktales of the Old World and the New except what can clearly be traced back to the result of known contact. The two bodies of fiction are essentially dissimilar." P. 59. The newly found Maja remains showing a striking similarity between Aztetic and Egyptian culture would go against the statement if the first surmises are confirmed. Even Mohenjo Daro and Harappa may warn us as well not to be too confident about the loan theory and its likelihood or the contrary. The material for final conclusions in favour of the theory on the strength of similar groupings of ideas does not seem to be sufficient as yet.

This is not the place to inquire into the genuineness and historicity of the Gospels of the New Testament and the relation between them. If Professor Brown is satisfied that his paragraphing shows it all very clearly where Mark's narrative was interrupted, the new (borrowed) legend inserted and the original narrative resumed by Matthew (cp. p. 48), he is to be congratulated on the slight effort such a conclusion costs him. The reviewer's critical sense would demand a little more in the way of a proof.

The last sentence of "The Indian and Christian Miracles of Walking on the Water" is not very fortunate. It runs as follows : 'The theory (of borrowing) as supported by the evidence available provides a reasonable explanation of the New Testament legends : otherwise there is none at hand." The reviewer agrees, provided the following "minor variations" are entered : Read "rationalistic" for "reasonable" ; about the evidence available to support this explanation of the New Testament "legends," enough has been said above ; but to lay it down that there is no other explanation at hand, is really a trifle too dogmatic. The reviewer can furnish the writer, if he desires so, with about half a dozen "explanations" of the New Testament legends, all about as good as that of Professor Brown. On p. 53 he says : "One explanation would be to accept the Gospel accounts as literally true or as being miraculous and uncritical exaggerations of incidents that actually occurred.

These ideas do not seem to me to demand our attention." In the face of the whole of Biblical criticism, accumulated during centuries, and ending in the historicity of the Synoptics, this seems to be a somewhat shallow statement. It is also a little strange when on p. 24 in connection with a meeting between the Buddha and Yasa, as related in a Chinese account (see Beal, The Romantic Legend of Sākya Buddha, pp. 263 ff.) the Professor states categorically: "There can be no doubt that a miracle was performed here." Whence such faith in Buddhist miracles all of a sudden, if miracles in the New Testament are "uncritical exaggerations of incidents that actually occured"? What is fair to the Far East should be so the Near East. But this would go against the loan theory, imply the historicity of the Gospel narratives and—perhaps worst of all—suppose the philosophical possibility of real, not fictitious, miracles. And there seem still to be people whose attention such things do not demand. The poor reviewer may be pardoned if he would like to see the reasons, especially in a book brought out by The Open Court Publishing Company.

R. ZIMMERMANN, S.J.

THE BHAGAVADGITĀ. BY W. DOUGLAS P. HILL, M.A. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1928. PRICE 15*s.* NET.

It is true, without doubt, that a perfect piece of Art, produced in any age, if it survive the vicissitudes of ravenous Time and come to be part of Man's heritage, never fails to exercise a ceaseless fascinating influence upon him one way or another. And so it is, because Art's appeal is universal and its great enterprise is the quest of things eternal in the world of sights and sounds and other senses where nothing abides. Art endeavours to seize hold of and to imprison the fleeting flying Perfect, and by contemplation of it to escape from the Tyranny of ugly painful Change.

The Bhagavadgīta as it has come down to us bears this unique character, and consequently has called forth from time to time translations and commentaries intended to lead the busy layman in the presence of the Deity which Art creates and puts out of

sight by an overhanging veil of paradoxes. Here we have another translation and a commentary by Principal Hill who in the Bibliographical Notes of his great work aptly remarks that "the ancient commentators were faced with the alternative of denying their own tenets or wresting the text to their own ends. Each one chose the latter course". The Moderns, we fear, have not deviated from the course followed by their ancestors.

Principal Hill, who is thoroughly in sympathy with the work of which he is speaking, writes with perfect ease, and his style has qualities of clarity, energy, order, unity, restraint and beauty, which one usually misses in the writings of modern commentators. His critical sense combined with erudition prepares him to examine with acumen the writings of both oriental and occidental scholars, past and present, and to show where he differs from them and why. When a text baffles his powers of interpretation, he does not torture it, but in giving it some plausible meaning, frankly speaks of the difficulty experienced. Nevertheless, it is then that the unconscious ruling bias of the author becomes plainly visible in the interpretation put upon the text.

To take but one instance, on page 219, the author has a real difficulty in elucidating verse 12 of Chapter 12. If he had no strong prejudice in favour of devotion as against knowledge which he, with subdued contempt, describes as cold unfeeling, perhaps he would have had no difficulty in sensing the great fact of successive stages of one comprehensive and indivisible process which Krishna was emphasizing to Arjuna. The great error into which unwary interpreters and commentators usually fall is that they assume that these stages are present at once, that they coexist in an individual and that they can be contrasted. The truth, however, is that they occur in temporal order—each becoming its own successor and in so becoming ceases to be. And one has always to bear in mind that the level of discourse is invariably conditioned by the present state. Thus viewed the Śloka offers no difficulty and incidentally throws a deal of light upon the central idea of the Gītā—Redemption from Change by the process of lifting oneself up from level to level until peace ensues. Meanwhile any forced attempt to ignore the order of levels or to skip over any one of them

necessarily throws back the individual to the level to which he belongs and thus indeed the promised beatitude is postponed.

We welcome this great work of Principal Hill and recommend it to our readers for its profound scholarship, its successful bringing into focus of scattered problems of the Gītā, and its clear statement of the Message of the Gītā, as conceived by the author.

D. P. THAKORE.

AN ARABIC HISTORY OF GUJARAT : ẒAFAR UL-WĀLIH BI MUẒAFFAR WA ĀLIH. BY 'ABDALLĀH MUḤAMMAD b. 'OMAR AL-MAKKI, AL-ĀSAFI, ULUGHKHĀNI. ED. BY SIR E. DENISON ROSS. VOL. III, TEXT AND INDEXES. PP. c x v + 42 + ۸۵۳ TO ۱۰۹۷ MURRAY (FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA), LONDON, 21*s*. 1928.

This is the third volume of the Indian Text Series, published under the patronage of the Government of India, and contains the last portion of the text of the Arabic History of Gujarat, together with indexes, a glossary and other apparatus criticus.

The latest event recorded in this volume is the accession of the Emperor Akbar, 963/1556. Thus the three volumes contain valuable information regarding Gujarat from the accession of Muhammad Shah, 1443, to the beginning of the reign of Akbar, and it is really Daftar i (*i.e.*, Vol. I and part of Vol. II, p. 643) which is most important for the historian. Daftar II deals with earlier history and is merely a compilation from other sources.

The text is printed by Brill in Leiden in their well-known type. Though clear, considering the excellent get-up of the volume, we wish the more beautiful Beyrout type had been employed. It is curious that while Egypt is advancing by leaps and bounds in the matter of typography, European scholars continue to be faithful to the ugly Leiden founts.

This volume also contains a full index of names; a list of topics, anecdotes and curiosities; notes and corrections; a short glossary of Arabic and Persian expressions; and a list of works referred to in the text. The very full index of names opens out a

mine of information for students of history; the list of topics gives us glimpses of the condition of society then prevailing; and the glossary though meagre, is a great help in the elucidation of a text which in parts presents great difficulties.

Apart from its general importance for the History of Gujarat, our author also throws considerable light on such interesting and comparatively little-known topics as the connection of Habshis (Abyssinians) with the history of Western India. And when a proper account of such States as Janjira and Sachin comes to be written, our author Haji Dabir, being himself the secretary of a prominent Habshi noble, will contribute notably to this romantic episode in the history of Western India.

At the sight of these scholarly volumes, we sympathise with Sir Denison Ross on his bidding farewell to Haji Dabir and congratulate him on the accomplishment of a task which has taken him a quarter of a century. We hope that the English translation may soon see the light of day.

A. A. A. F.

FRAGMENTS FROM DIṄNĀGA, BY R. N. RANDLE, M.A.—*The Royal Asiatic Society Prize Publication Fund. Vol. IX.* 1926. *Price 6/- net.*

This is a very important contribution to the Prize Publications of the Royal Asiatic Society. Mr. Randle has qualified himself for such a highly technical work which bespeaks his careful study of the Nyāya (Logic) of India. Diṅnāga, till about the last 50 years, was merely a name very highly respected as that of one of the greatest logicians of about the 6th or 7th century A.D. A Brahmin of Āndhra converted to Buddhism, he carried on, in his advanced age, a vigorous fight against Brahminism by his extraordinary capacity of logical arguments which cost him, so to say, his very existence in the country of his birth. In his advanced age, he migrated to Tibet and in recent times it was believed that all his highly technical and banned works on Nyāya had gone with him. It was as it were an exile of a branch of learning.

The late Satish Chandra Vidyabhushana during his long stay in Tibet was able to unearth the Tibetan translations of many of

the works of Diṅnāga, which had further migrated to China and some of them even to Japan. This information was first given to us by Sadagira Sugiura, a Japanese scholar of Philadelphia. Satish Chandra spoke very highly of these translations and in spite of his very careful and laborious work, he had to admit that there was no work of Diṅnāga to be found in India. Fortunately, a scholar of Baroda has recently been able to find out one of his works in original Sanskrit in one of the Bhandars of Patan in Gujerat. For several years we have been hearing that the Oriental MSS. Library of Baroda has under preparation an edition thereof. We are still, even after 8 or 9 years, without the appearance of the work, although it may be said to the credit of another eminent scholar that he has been able to publish in the Gaekwar Series the Tibetan version thereof.

Diṅnāga's Fragments are collected from several works especially of Vācaspati and Udyotakara two of his eminent successors who took occasion to refute his theories. The Fragments show a time prior to the fusion of the theories of Nyāya and Viseshika. The latter works are written in abundance in the last eight or nine centuries but it also exhibits a time when Syllogism rules were discussed, augmented and clarified. The important introduction of Vyāpti took place some time prior to Diṅnāga's time and Diṅnāga had his share in developing this branch of Inductive Logic, which ultimately gave us a syllogism not purely formal but a fusion of induction and deduction. One need not say that induction took its root with the authors of the 7th century. The method had long been employed though not put in very technical and logical form. We find it in some of the scientific investigations of the great medical authority Caraka. Even as early as Gautama, who, according to Satish Chandra, may have flourished about the 5th century B.C., the idea was present though not in a very developed form, in the Sūtras of that primeval author.

Diṅnāga as a Buddhist did not believe in the authority of the Vedas and that led him to repudiate the authority of testimony. He is averse to accepting the authority of analogy. According to him there are two sources of knowledge and two only, *viz.*, Perception and Inference. Controversies on this subject have raged high

for centuries together, without the scholars acquiescing into one another's views and in the nature of things the controversy may last for ever. But the arguments in favour of recognising two and only two sources of knowledge are in no way weak from the mere standpoint of reason. It is a very interesting method to show how Buddhist logicians like Diṅnāga have shown that Analogy and Testimony are nothing but Inference.

The development of Syllogism, which originally according to Vātsyāyana may have been of ten members, into five and the further reduction into three and a still further conversational reduction into two is very interesting.

We congratulate Prof. Randle for the extremely useful collection of these Fragments with their translations and explanatory notes, which make the work really a classical and standard treatise on ancient logic. Prof. Thomas of Oxford also deserves credit for the encouragement he gives to Oriental scholars in their studies. One other similar work was of Prof. Ui written on the Vaiśeṣika system. We recommend these works to the careful study of all scholars of Indian system of philosophy.

V. P. VAIDYA.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society

Annual Report for 1928

The year under review has been significant mainly for internal rearrangements made with a view to increasing comfort and convenience in the use of the Society's library. The most evident of these rearrangements has been the introduction of a new system of lighting, whereby inverted globes suspended at the floor-level of the gallery in all the rooms have taken the place of the numerous shade lights. The effect is a much greater volume of light—approximately twice the previous candle-power—and such a distribution as allows of all the book-cases, upstairs as well as down, being inspected in a clear light. This new system of lighting brings us into line with the rest of the Town Hall and the principal buildings and public offices of Bombay.

Work has proceeded in the arrangement of books in the file-room accommodation on the ground floor of the Town Hall received from Government, as reported last year. Bound volumes of magazines have thus been arranged, and Departmental Reports of Government have found suitable places for ready reference.

Finally, so far as internal arrangements are concerned, the working hours of the Library have been extended, the closing time being now 7-30 p.m. instead of 7-10 p.m. (S.T.).

Negotiations are proceeding to transfer the Campbell Memorial Fund under the Charitable Endowments Act. Meanwhile,

the Society's Managing Committee has agreed to raise the limit of emolument to recipients of the Medal from Rs. 100 to Rs. 500, the Fund being in a flourishing condition through appreciation of its investments and its capital and, in consequence, too large for the charges which it has to face according to its own rules.

Rules for the award of the Society's Medal (in silver) have been framed and approved by the Managing Committee and the General Body, and it is proposed to make the first award in 1930, an award of the Campbell Memorial Medal being due this year.

The Society having decided not to lend its collection of coins to the Prince of Wales Museum, the existing preliminary lists of the coins have now to be revised so as to open the cabinet to the researches of scholars. The Managing Committee has recommended that Rs. 500 should be set aside in the budget for the coming year for the purposes of this revision. The Loan Form to cover its interests in the other collections, *viz.*, the Archæological, Geological and Anthropological, already lent to the Museum, has been under consideration during the year between the Society and the Trustees of the Museum, and agreement has been reached on nearly all its provisions.

In addition to learned articles, the Society has published in its Journal, in the course of the year, a catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in its possession. The General Catalogue of the Society's manuscripts has seen the publication of its second volume, covering Hindu Literature, during the year and it is expected that the publication of the remaining material will be completed in the year now begun.

The year 1929 should be one of special significance for the Society, seeing that it marks the 125th year of its existence. The history of the Society, from its foundation in 1804 as the Bombay Literary Society, is one of the finest parts of the history of Bombay, and it is proposed, at the celebration of the 125th anniversary on or about the 26th November, to bring together material illustrative of the great part it has played in the intellectual life of the city and presidency.

Meanwhile, it has been arranged to ask His Excellency Sir Frederick Sykes to unveil, in February or March, a bust of William Erskine, Esq., who was one of the promoters of the

Bombay Literary Society and its first Secretary, holding this office from 1804 to 1815.

The effort made during the past year by the Executive and several members in particular to get more members, both Resident and Non-Resident, succeeded in so far as its main object was concerned, for the total number of new members during the year rose to 96. Relatively, however, there is no increase to register, for the number of resignations has also risen to the same number. We can say, therefore, only that we have held our own in these days of such enhanced difficulty in securing interest in higher cultural pursuits, but we are encouraged to go on and attempt to make this coming anniversary year one of decided advance in our material prospects.

A statement of the receipts and expenditure is subjoined. It is regretted that the financial position does not show the improvement anticipated. The total receipts realised were slightly in excess of the figure estimated, but, unfortunately, on the other hand the expenses show a bigger increase.

We have now reached a stage where we have only the actual annual income with which to meet current expenditure and no credit balance to fall back upon. Whilst every effort is made to economise, it is impossible to see how any reduction can be made in the Establishment and Standing Charges without adversely affecting the efficiency of the Library. The Committee have given careful consideration to the budget estimates for the next year and have found it necessary to budget for a small deficit of Rs. 536. If the membership is not increased, this deficit will be greater. It is, therefore, hoped that members will make every effort to find new members and make known the advantages of the library to persons likely to join the Society.

During the year under review we had to meet the cost of the 1927 Journal Printing amounting to Rs. 2,700 against Rs. 2,100 estimated. In this present year we have budgeted Rs. 1,750 to cover the cost of the two Journal numbers for 1928, which are already in the printer's hands, but it is a matter for great regret, that it is impossible to make any further grant for any Journal number in 1929.

Members

Resident :—

On the roll on 1–1–28.	New admissions.	Non-Res. become Resident.	Resigned or ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Non-Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1–1–29.
500	71	8	74	15	2	488

Non-Resident :—

On the roll on 1–1–28.	New admissions.	Resident become Non-Res.	Resigned or ceased to be Members	Transferred to the Res. list.	Number of Members on 1–1–29.
161	25	15	19	8	174

Of the 488 Resident Members, 46 are Life-Members, and of the 174 Non-Resident Members, 13 are Life-Members.

Obituary

The Committee regret to record the death of the following Members :—

Resident :—

Mr. K. Jagadisan.
,, C. C. Sherwood.

Papers read and lectures delivered before the Society

20th January 1928. A short discourse on "Some Problems of Indian Philology". By Professor Heinrich Lüders.

27th January 1928. A public lecture, illustrated by lantern slides, on "Beautiful Austria". By Miss Alice Schalek (of Vienna).

27th August 1928. A paper on "Rustam Manock (1635-1721), the Parsi Broker of the East India Company, Surat". By Dr. J. J. Modi, B.A., Ph. D., C.I.E.

Library

Issues :—

Old Books.	New Books.	Loose Periodicals.	Total.	Average per working day.
25,626	13,264	33,625	72,515	248

Additions :—

The total number of volumes added was 1,361, of which 1,072 were purchased and 289 were presented.

Books presented to the Society were received, as usual, from the Government of India, the Government of Bombay, and other Provincial Governments, as well as from the Trustees of the Parsi Punchayat Funds, other public bodies and individual donors.

A meeting of the Society, under Art. 29 of the Rules, was held on the 22nd of November for the purpose of revising the list of the papers and periodicals received by the Society, and it was decided—

(*a*) To take the Saturday Review from 1929, and

(*b*) to omit the following from the same date :—

(1) John O'London, (2) Sunday Times, (3) English Review, (4) Geological Magazine, (5) Library World, (6) Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science, (7) Dublin Review, (8) Health and Empire, (9) Round Table, (10) Sociological Review, (11) Society for Pure English Tracts, (12) Writers' and Artists' Year Book, (13) Revue de Paris, (14) Century, (15) Madras Mail, (16) Bombay Co-operative Quarterly, (17) Bombay Law Journal, (18) Hindustan Review, (19) Shama'a, (20) Social Service Quarterly, and (21) Welfare.

No. 11 was omitted from the list on the understanding that the Tracts would be purchased as they were issued.

The Journal

One joint number of the Journal, consisting of Nos. 1 and 2 of Vol. III, was published during the year. The following are the principal articles in the number :

A. A. A. Fyzee—A descriptive list of the Arabic, Persian and Urdu MSS. in the B. B. R. A. Society.

V. S. Bakhle—Satavahanas and the Contemporary Kshatrapas.

S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar—The Bappa Bhatticharita and the early history of the Gurjara Empire.

A. Venkatasubbiah—The Authors of the Raghavapandaviya and Gadyachintamani.

E. M. Ezekiel—Position of Woman in Rabbinical Literature.

D. B. Diskalkar—Some Copper Plate Grants recently discovered.

H. Heras—Three Mughal Paintings on Akbar's Religious Discourses.

R. R. Haldar—Some Reflections on Prithviraja Rasa.

Jivanji J. Modi—The Story of Alexander the Great and the Poison Damsel of India.

Vaijanath K. Rajwade—Indra's Enemies.

J. C. Tavadia—Some important Indological Publications.

Coin Cabinet

202 coins were added to the Society's Cabinet during the year under report. The coins are of the following description :—

South Indian

13 gold, 3 silver and 2 copper .. .. ..Total 18

Mughal Emperors of India

137 silver and 3 copper 140

Sultans of Delhi

Copper 37

Contemporaries of Early Sultans

Copper 6

Treasure Trove Coins

There were 662 coins with the Society at the close of 1927. The following finds consisting of 339 coins were received for examination during the year under report :

39 silver from the Collector of Satara.
79 gold from the Collector of Satara.
15 gold from the Collector of Dharwar.
189 silver from the Mint Master, Bombay (C.P.coins).
17 silver from the Collector of Nasik.

Out of the total 1,001 coins, 214 were reported to Government and, with their approval, were distributed to the different institutions and Durbars. At the end of 1928 there remain with the Society 787 coins awaiting examination or distribution.

The Society's best thanks are due to Mr. G. V. Acharya, B.A., Curator, Archæological Section, Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, and Mr. C. R. Singhal, his Gallery Assistant, for kindly assisting the Society in examining the Treasure Trove Coins in 1928 as in previous years. Mr. Acharya examined the Non-Mahomedan coins and Mr. Singhal the Mahomedan coins.

The Bombay Branch

Abstract of Receipts and Payments

RECEIPTS.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
To cash balance 1st January 1928			
Current Account		248 13 0	
Savings Bank		8,420 11 1	
In Office		56 4 6	
			8,725 12 7
,, Subscriptions—			
Resident Life Members		500 0 0	
Non-Resident Life Members		150 0 0	
			650 0 0
Resident Members		23,795 0 0	
Non-Resident Members		3,905 0 0	
			27,700 0 0
,, Entrance Fees		....	1,880 0 0
,, Grants : Government of India		....	3,000 0 0
,, Publications : Journal Sales		....	1,099 4 11
,, Catalogues—			
General			
Sale Proceeds	149 0 0		
Interest from investments	200 0 0		
		349 0 0	
Manuscripts		196 11 0	
Annual		36 5 0	
			582 0 0
,, Sundry Sales—			
Waste Paper		....	56 12 0
,, Interest on Investments—			
Government Securities		1,056 15 8	
Savings Bank		204 15 6	
			1,861 15 2
,, Replacements		....	209 10 0
Total Rs.			46,365 6 8

We have examined the above abstract of Receipts and payments with the books and vouchers of the Society and we hereby certify the said abstract to be true and correct. We have also ascertained that all the securities belonging to the Society are held for safe custody by the Imperial Bank of India.

C. H. DENNISON,
A. B. AGASKAR,

Auditors.

Royal Asiatic Society

for the year ended 31*st December* 1928

PAYMENTS.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
By Office—		
Establishment	18,409 2 11	
General Charges	957 10 9	
Printing and Stationery	1,812 0 0	
Postage	447 8 0	
Insurance	281 4 0	
Electric Charges	619 15 9	
Provident Fund Contribution ..	1,393 2 9	
		23,921 5 2
,, Library Expenditure—		
Books	7,133 6 6	
Indian Periodicals	708 5 6	
Foreign ,, ...	2,527 5 0	
Book-Binding and Repairs	1,425 5 0	
Shelving, Furniture and Fittings ..	3,459 2 8	
		15,253 8 8
,, Publication Account—		
Journal Printing		2,701 9 0
,, Catalogues—		
Card : Preparation	243 0 0	
Manuscripts : Printing	1,750 0 0	
		1,993 0 0
,, Securities purchased during the year— Rs. 1,500, Indian 3½% Loan 1900–01 ..		1,098 12 0
,, Balance on 31st December 1928 (including Rs. 497-7-3 of the General Catalogue Fund and Rs. 210-8-0 of the Reserve Fund)—		
Current Account	144 6 3	
Savings Bank	1,200 10 7	
In Office	52 3 0	
		1,397 3 10
Total Rs. ..		46,365 6 8

Invested Funds of the Society.

				Face value.	
Reserve Fund	6½%	Govt.	Securities	1,100	
	5 %	do.	do.	10,800	
	3½%	do.	do.	26,400	
Premchand Roychand ..	..3½%	do.	do.	3,000	
Catalogue Fund	..5 %	do.	do.	4,000	
Shelving Fund	..3½%	do.	do.	2,000	
Contingent Fund	..3½%	do.	do.	800	
					48,100

EDWARD PARKER,
Hon. Secretary.

J. S. TILLEY,
Hon. Fincl. Secretary.

The Bombay Branch

Budget Esti

RECEIPTS.	Budget 1928			Actual 1928			Budget 1929		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Balance	8,725	12	7	8,725	12	7	690	0	0
Proceeds of Contingent Fund	....			....			600	0	0
Entrance Fee	1,500	0	0	1,880	0	0	1,750	0	0
Subn. Resident Members ..	24,500	0	0	23,705	0	0	24,500	0	0
,, Non-Resident Members	3,750	0	0	3,905	0	0	4,000	0	0
Government Contribution ..	3,600	0	0	3,600	0	0	3,000	0	0
Sale of Journal Numbers ..	700	0	0	1,099	4	11	1,000	0	0
,, Annual Catalogues ..	25	0	0	36	5	0	25	0	0
,, Waste Paper	50	0	0	56	12	0	50	0	0
,, Manuscript Catalogues	75	0	0	106	11	0	200	0	0
Interest	2,000	0	0	1,861	15	2	1,750	0	0
Deficit	....			....			536	0	0
Total Rs. ..	44,925	12	7				38,701	0	0

Campbell

A Statement of Accounts for two

	Rs.	a.	p.
Balance on 1st January 1927	435	15	4
Interest, less Bank Commission, 1927	195	8	0
Do. 1928	210	13	0
Total ..	842	4	4

Royal Asiatic Society

mates for 1929

PAYMENTS.	Budget 1928			Actual 1928			Budget 1929		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Books	7,000	0	0	7,133	6	6	7,000	0	0
Subn. Indian Periodicals ..	700	0	0	708	5	6	650	0	0
,, Foreign	2,250	0	0	2,527	5	0	2,100	0	0
Journal Printing	2,100	0	0	2,701	9	0	1,750	0	0
Binding and Repairs	1,200	0	0	1,425	5	0	1,200	0	0
Printing and Stationery ..	1,550	0	0	1,812	9	0	1,500	0	0
Office Establishment	18,050	0	0	18,409	2	11	18,500	0	0
General Charges	825	0	0	957	10	9	825	0	0
Postage	325	0	0	447	8	0	350	0	0
Insurance	281	4	0	281	4	0	282	0	0
Electric Charges	600	0	0	619	15	9	750	0	0
Provident Fund..	1,400	0	0	....			2,994	0	0
Temporary Establishment ..	144	0	0	144	0	0	....		
Mss. Catalogue Printing ..	1,750	0	0	1,750	0	0	800	0	0
Contribution to the Staff's Provident Fund to be paid ..	1,393	2	9	1,393	2	9	....		
¼th Entrance Fee to be invested	370	0	0	....			....		
Library Furniture and Fittings	4,974	0	0	3,459	2	8	....		
Balance	13	5	10				....		
Total Rs. ..	44,925	12	7				38,701	0	0

Memorial Fund

years ending 31*st December* 1928

	Rs.	a.	p.
Cost of 5% Government Loan, 1929–47, Rs. 500, purchased in 1928	505	10	0
Balance	336	10	4
Total ..	842	4	4

Invested Funds

	Face value.
5% Government Loan, 1929–47 ..	Rs. 4,500.

Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society Provident Fund

Income and Expenditure Account for the year ended 31st December 1928

EXPENDITURE.	Rs. a. p.	INCOME.	Rs. a. p.
To Sundry Expenses	8 3 0	By Members' Subscription	1,493 15 1
,, Amount repaid to members	94 10 0	,, Society's Contribution, 1928	1,493 15 1
,, Balance	3,391 0 10	,, Interest	505 15 8
Total Rs. ..	3,493 13 10	Total Rs. ..	3,493 13 10

Balance Sheet 31st December 1928

	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Members' Account.				
Balance at 31st December 1927	10,978 4 0			
Add—Balance for 1928 ..	3,391 0 10		Cash at Bankers	1,857 8 9
			Sundry Debtors	
	14,369 4 10		Society's Contribution for 1928	1,493 15 1
Less—Forfeitures transferred to			Investments at Cost.	
Reserve Account ..	427 4 7		Rs. 10,500 in 5% Govt. Loan 1945-55	11,017 13 0
		13,942 0 3		
Reserve Account		427 4 7		
Total Rs. ..		14,369 4 10	Total Rs. ..	14,369 4 10

We have examined the above accounts together with the Books and Vouchers and found same to be correctly stated. We have also ascertained that the securities relating to the investments of the fund are held for safe custody by the Imperial Bank of India.

EDWARD PARKER,
Hon. Secretary.

J. S. TILLEY,
Hon. Fincl. Secretary.

C. H. DENNISON,
A. B. AGASKAR,
Hon. Auditors.

The Annual General Meeting of the Society was held on Monday, 18th March 1929.

Present :—Dr. Jivanji J. Mody, Mr. V. P. Vaidya, Rev. Dr. R. Zimmermann, Dr. D. A. De Monte, Messrs. S. V. Bhandarkar, P. V. Kane, G. V. Acharya, K. M. Jhaveri, R. C. Goffin, J. E. Aspinwall, A. A. A. Fyzee, M. D. Altekar, Prof. C. R. Shah, Prof. N. B. Divatia, Prof. A. B. Gajendragadkar, Dr. G. S. Ghurye, Prof. E. M. Ezekiel, Rev. Fr. H. Heras, Prof. P. A. Wadia, Messrs. G. M. Matani, G. N. Vaidya, B. R. Madgavkar, T. S. Shejvalkar, S. R. Bakhle, D. G. Dalvi, B. A. Fernandes, K. K. Menon, C. J. Shah, V. H. Mehta, C. H. Dennison, B. K. Wagle, V. R. Karandikar, J. M. Adhikari, Prof. V. A. Gadgil, Prof. H. D. Velankar, Miss K. H. Adenwalla, Prof. J. C. Daruvala, Dr. Balkrishna, Mr. N. G. Devare and Dr. Edward Parker, the Hon. Secretary.

Dr. J. J. Modi, the Senior Vice-President, was voted to the Chair.

The minutes of the last Annual General Meeting were read and confirmed.

The annual report with the statement of accounts for 1928 and the budget for 1929, having been previously circulated to all members, was taken as read.

The Chairman proposed that the report with accounts and budget be adopted and in doing so drew the attention of the meeting to important features in the report.

Mr. V. P. Vaidya seconded the proposal.

Mr. P. V. Kane regretted that on account of financial stringency no amount could be budgeted for publication of the Journal numbers of 1929. The sum of Rs. 1,700 shown in the budget, he said, was for numbers of 1928 which had just been published. Mr. Kane pointed out that the Journal was perhaps the only feature left of their activities as an Asiatic Society, and suggested that a provision of Rs. 600 for one small number of about 80 pages be made by applying cuts to other items.

The Hon. Secretary said that in his opinion it would be advisable to advertise the Society in the prominent papers of Bombay in order to attract members to it. He would be glad to try this

as an experiment if the meeting would give him Rs. 500 for the purpose by increasing the income from Resident subscriptions to Rs. 25,000 in the budget.

Rev. Fr. Heras requested that a provision of Rs. 500 should be made for revising and completing the list of coins in the Coin Cabinet of the Society. As a member of the Coin Committee he drew the attention of the members to the fact that the collection of coins was of no value to scholars unless a reliable list of the coins was prepared.

The Hon. Secretary stated that he had been alive to the importance of the Journal publication as well as to the preparation of the coin list. He had an idea of raising a special fund for the purpose, and would place definite proposals before the next meeting of the Managing Committee, which will approach the General Body if necessary.

The report was then put to the vote and unanimously adopted.

The Chairman then proposed and Mr. Aspinwall seconded that His Excellency the Governor of Bombay be requested to be graciously pleased to accept the Presidentship of the Society for 1929. *Carried.*

On the motion of Prof. N. B. Divatia, seconded by Mr. K. M. Jhaveri, the Vice-Presidents of 1928 were re-elected.

The Chairman proposed that Dr. Parker be elected Honorary Secretary for the current year.

Dr. De Monte seconded and the proposal was carried.

The meeting then proceeded to elect 15 members of the Managing Committee from among the following 31 names duly proposed and seconded :

Mr. J. E. Aspinwall	Dr. D. A. De Monte
Prof. P. A. Wadia	Mr. P. V. Kane
,, E. M. Ezekiel	,, S. V. Bhandarkar
Mr. M. D. Altekar	Prof. N. B. Divatia
,, G. V. Acharya	Principal W. E. G. Solomon
,, K. M. Jhaveri	Mr. A. A. A. Fyzee
Dr. G. S. Ghurye	Rev. Fr. H. Heras
Mr. R. D. Choksi	Prof. A. B. Gajendragadkar
,, B. K. Wagle	,, C. R. Shah
,, R. C. Goffin	,, H. D. Velankar

Mr. K. H. Vakil	Prof. J. C. Daruvala
„ G. N. Vaidya	Maulvi Rafiuddin Ahmed
Sir Chunilal Mehta	Sir Dorab Tata
„ Reginald Spence	Mr. Faiz B. Tyabji
Mr. A. R. Dalal	„ R. P. Masani
„ G. E. Harvey	

The Chairman nominated Mr. B. K. Wagle and Mr. A. A. A. Fyzee to scrutinize the ballot papers.

The following was the result of the ballot :—

Mr. G. V. Acharya	Dr. G. S. Ghurye
„ M. D. Altekar	Rev. Fr. H. Heras
„ J. E. Aspinwall	Mr. K. M. Jhaveri
„ S. V. Bhandarkar	„ P. V. Kane
Prof. N. B. Divatia	Prof. H. D. Velankar
„ E. M. Ezekiel	„ P. A. Wadia
Mr. A. A. A. Fyzee	Mr. B. K. Wagle
Prof. A. B. Gajendragadkar	

Dr. Parker proposed and Mr. Jhaveri seconded that Mr. C. H. Dennison and Mr. A. B. Agaskar be requested to continue their services to the Society as Auditors during 1929.

Mr. V. P. Vaidya having proposed and Mr. Aspinwall having seconded, a hearty vote of thanks was given to the Auditors for their kind assistance in auditing the accounts of 1928.

With a vote of thanks to the Chair the proceedings terminated.

TRANSLITERATION OF THE SANSKRIT AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

अ	*a*	औ	*au*	ठ	*ṭh*	भ	*bh*
आ	*ā*	क	*k*	ड	*ḍ*	म	*m*
इ	*i*	ख	*kh*	ढ	*ḍh*	य	*y*
ई	*ī*	ग	*g*	ण	*ṇ*	र	*r*
उ	*u*	घ	*gh*	त	*t*	ल	*l*
ऊ	*ū*	ङ	*ṅ*	थ	*th*	व	*v*
ऋ	*ṛ*	च	*c*	द	*d*	श	*ś*
ॠ	*ṝ*	छ	*ch*	ध	*dh*	ष	*ṣ*
ऌ	*ḷ*	ज	*j*	न	*n*	स	*s*
ए	*e*	झ	*jh*	प	*p*	ह	*h*
ऐ	*ai*	ञ	*ñ*	फ	*ph*	ळ	*ḻ*
ओ	*o*	ट	*ṭ*	ब	*b*		

ं (*Anusvāra*)	*ṁ*	× (*Jihvāmūlīya*)	*ẖ*
ँ (*Anunāsika*)	*m̐*	≍ (*Upadhmānīya*)	*ḫ*
ः (*Visarga*)	*ḥ*	ऽ (*Avagraha*)	'

TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

Arabic.

ا	a	ز	z	ق	q	ـِ	i or e
ب	b	س	s	ک	k	ـُ	u or o
ت	t	ش	sh	ل	l	ـَا	ā
ث	th	ص	ṣ	م	m	ـِي	ī, e
ج	j	ض	ḍ	ن	n	ـُو	ū, o
ح	ḥ	ط	ṭ	و	w	ـَی	ai
خ	kh	ظ	ẓ	ه	h	ـَو	au
د	d	ع	ʻ	ی	y	silent t	h̤
ذ	dh	غ	gh	ء	ʼ		
ر	r	ف	f	ـَ	a		

Persian.

پ	p	چ	ch	ژ	zh	گ	g

Printed by H. W. Smith at the Times of India Press, Bombay, and published by E. A. Parker, Hon. Secy., for the Bombay Branch, Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.